

Zur Vertheidigung
der
Organischen Methode
in der
Sociologie

von
Paul v. Lilienfeld.



Berlin,
Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer.
1898.

Original Cover (15 x 23.3 cm.)

Zur Vertheidigung
der
Organischen Methode
in der
Sociologie

von
Paul v. Lilienfeld.

With English translation (p. 43)
by
Howard Hill



Berlin
Druck und Verlag von Georg Reimer.
1898.

V o r w o r t.

Die Methodenlehre der Sociologie bildete den Hauptgegenstand der Berathungen des dritten internationalen sociologischen Congresses, der im vorigen Jahre in Paris getagt hat, und den zu präsidiren ich die Ehre hatte. Die Arbeiten des Congresses sind in dem kürzlich in Paris erschienenen vierten Bande der Annales de l'Institut international de Sociologie veröffentlicht worden. — Ueber die Methodenlehre selbst wurden auf dem Congresse verschiedene, ja entgegengesetzte Ansichten vertreten. Die organische, psychologische, historische, statistische, die anthropologische und ethnographische vergleichende Methoden fanden ihre Vertheidiger. Es handelte sich dabei nicht blos um die Art und Weise des Vorgehens bei Erforschung des socialen Geschehens, sondern vielmehr darum, ob die Sociologie als positive Wissenschaft sich der Biologie anschliessen oder als eine von der Naturkunde losgetrennte Disciplin anerkannt werden soll.

Die Wichtigkeit dieser Frage hat mich bewogen, die vorliegende Schrift zu veröffentlichen. Meinem Ausgangspunkte habe ich die neuesten Ergebnisse der Physiologie und positiven Psychologie zu Grunde gelegt ; die philosophische Seite der von mir vertretenen Anschauung habe ich jedoch in dieser Schrift nur flüchtig streifen können und auf so manche Ausführungen verzichten müssen, um nicht aus dem mir vorgezeichneten Rahmen hinauszutreten zutreten. Aus demselben Grunde war ich auch öfters gezwungen im Verlaufe meiner Erörterungen zu ihrer Begründung mich auf mein Hauptwerk : „Gedanken über die Socialwissenschaft der Zukunft“, sowie auf meine später erschienenen Monographien zu berufen.

Das Interesse, das die Sociologie in der letzten Zeit auch in Deutschland hervorgerufen hat, wird hoffentlich nicht ermangeln, frische Kräfte in den Bereich dieser Wissenschaft hineinzuziehen und mit ihrer Hilfe die wichtige Frage über die Methode in der Sociologie zur Entscheidung bringen.

St. Petersburg, März 1898.

Der Verfasser.

Seitdem der Mensch dem thierischen Zustande entwachsen ist, hat er stets im gesellschaftlichen Verbande mit Seinesgleichen gelebt. Die rein menschlichen Anlagen, Gaben und psychischen Energieen hat er nur im Verkehr mit anderen Menschen erworben. Nur durch das sociale Leben ist der Vormensch zum Urmenschen und dieser zum Culturmenschen allmählig geworden. Mit dem Menschen entstand somit auch die menschliche Gesellschaft. In seinen Bedürfnissen, Strebungen und geistigen Anlagen stand wohl der Urmensch der höheren Thierspecies, von welcher er abstammte, näher, er befand sich in engerer Abhängigkeit von dem ihn umgebenden physischen Medium, als seine Nachfolger, aber er fühlte, dachte und wirkte schon ursprünglich nach denselben Gesetzen wie heutigen Tages der Culturmensch. Desgleichen und aus denselben Gründen folgte die menschliche Gesellschaft bereits von ihrem Urzustande an denselben Grundgesetzen und bot dieselben wesentlichen Erscheinungen dar, wie auch die modernen höchstentwickelten Staatsbildungen. Auf allen Stufen des historischen Entwicklungsprocesses der Menschheit verblieben die Grundelemente der socialen Wechselwirkung zwischen den einzelnen Gliedern der Gesellschaft, blieb ihr innerer Aufbau, blieben die Beziehungen zur Aussenwelt dem Wesen nach dieselben. Die Uebergänge von einem niederen Entwicklungsstadium zu einem höheren wurden nur Schritt vor Schritt bewerkstelligt und durch allmähliche und meistentheils kaum merkbare Umgestaltungen und Veränderungen gekennzeichnet. Die äusseren Conflicte zwischen einzelnen Gesellschaftsgruppen, die zu Eroberungen, politischen Umwälzungen, ja, zur Ausrottung ganzer Völkerschaften und Racen geführt haben, widersprechen dieser Anschauung ebenso wenig, wie solches der Zusammenstoss zwischen einzelnen Individuen thun könnte. Der Sieger stellt seinerseits gleichfalls ein nur allmählig historisch erworbenes Capital von persönlichen physischen und psychischen Energieen dar. Es handelte sich also dabei immer nur um eine äussere Verdrängung und Vernichtung der schwächeren, unentwickelteren Elemente durch quantitativ oder qualitativ stärkere oder höhere. Aber letztere sind, wie gesagt, auch, wenn auch unter anderen Himmelsstrichen und anderen physischen und socialen Beeinflussungen, nur allmählig entstanden. Sie stellen, gleich den schwächeren und niederen Elementen, auch nur Etwas durch sociale Evolution Gewordenes dar. Verfolgt man die Entstehung und den Entwicklungsgang der stärkeren und höheren socialen Elemente in ihrem kausalen Zusammenhange, so überzeugt man sich, dass auch in Betreff letzterer die Uebergänge vom Niederen zum Höheren stets nur allmähliche waren. —

In welchem Verhältnisse stehen nun die Gesetze, durch welche die Entwicklung der menschlichen Gesellschaft bedingt wird, zu denjenigen allgemeinen Gesetzen, nach welchen die anorganischen und organischen Energieen in der Natur wirken ?

Zuvörderst muss entschieden werden, ob es überhaupt logisch möglich ist, die Existenz von zwei getrennten, absolut von einander verschiedenen Systemen von Gesetzen, durch welche der Kausalzusammenhang der Erscheinungen bestimmt wird, anzuerkennen. Wird solches zugestanden, so muss die Erscheinungswelt selbst in zwei absolut von einander verschiedene Hälften gespalten werden. Nun stellt aber die Erscheinungswelt ein ewiges Fliessen von Energieen dar, und wenn auch an einigen Theilen des gemeinschaftlichen Stromes ein zeitweiliges Gleichgewicht, ein scheinbares Erstarren der Kräfte eingetreten ist, wie solches bei der Bildung der festen Körper der Fall ist, so liefern letztere doch immer noch Zeugnisse ihrer gemeinschaftlichen Abzweigung und Herkunft aus einem und demselben gemeinschaftlichen Strome. Dasselbe gilt auch von den jetzt existirenden so mannichfach differencirten und in so

bestimmten Formen sich entwickelnden Lebewesen. Ihre gemeinschaftliche Abkunft aus einer und derselben ursprünglichen Lebensquelle kann bis an die Grenzen der anorganischen Natur, mit der sie zusammenfliesst, verfolgt werden. Kaum wird das metaphysische Secirmesser behufs Spaltung der Erscheinungswelt an einem Punkte angelegt, so entzieht sich das Object einer solchen Operation der Wahrnehmung des Beobachters, indem es mit den verwandten, in Zeit, Raum oder Potenz nächstliegenden Erscheinungen zusammenfliesst. Man hat wohl Versuche angestellt, Subject von Object, die innere Welt von der äusseren, zu theilen. Aber der Mensch ist zugleich Subject und Object. Er kann über die Erscheinungswelt nur durch Vermittelung von Sinnesperceptionen subjectiv urtheilen, aber die Sinne selbst bilden nur Theile des menschlichen Körpers und dieser bildet wiederum nur einen Theil der Erscheinungswelt. Daher ist es unmöglich, weder vom subjectiven noch vom objectiven Standpunkte aus, zu ergründen, was die Naturkräfte, die Gefühle, die Ideen an und für sich sind. Wir wissen nur, wie Göthe richtig ausgesprochen hat, dass im Subject ein gesetzmässiges Etwas ist, was dem gesetzmässigen Etwas im Object entspricht. Die Gesetzmässigkeit ist also das Eine gemeinschaftliche und die ganze neuere Philosophie, sowohl die idealistische als auch die materialistische, hat sich gerade zur Aufgabe gestellt diese Einheit alles gesetzmässigen Werdens auf verschiedenen Wegen zu ergründen.

Wie es kein absolutes Subject und kein absolutes Object giebt, so kann es auch keine absolut subjective, aprioristische und deductive im Gegensatz zu einer absolut objectiven, beobachtenden und inductiven Methode geben. Bei Ergründung der Gesetzmässigkeit der Erscheinungen kann es sich daher immer nur um ein Mehr oder Weniger der beiden Methoden handeln. Dieses Mehr oder Weniger drückt aber gerade der Methodenlehre ihren eigentlichen Charakter auf. Die Naturkunde bedient sich einer Methode überwiegend inductiven Charakters und verdankt der Anwendung derselben ihre ungeheuren Erfolge. In der Sociologie ist man aber bis jetzt vorzugsweise aprioristisch, deductiv vorgegangen. Die Resultate dieses Vorgehens sind bis jetzt nur negative gewesen. Man hat einen vollständigen Wirrwarr auf sociologischem Gebiete dadurch verursacht ohne irgend ein sociales Gesetz zu entdecken. Denn das, was einige Oekonomisten, Statistiker, Ethnographen, Historiker und auch Sociologen als sociale Gesetze ausgeben, kann nur auf einen zufälligen Kausalzusammenhang zwischen einzelnen Beziehungen, Personen oder Begebenheiten zurückgeführt werden. Dass unter gewissen Verhältnissen die Erhöhung der Brodpreise mit einer Vermehrung der Verbrechen und der Selbstmorde zusammenfällt, ein solcher aus einer grossen Zahl zufälliger Factoren bestimmter Parallelismus entspringt noch nicht einem nothwendigen Gesetze. Noch weniger kann die Gesetzmässigkeit auf socialem Gebiete von mittleren Zahlen oder Grössen, aus einer noch so langen Reihe von Daten und Ziffern abgeleitet werden. Alle nach der statistischen Methode aufgestellten sogenannten Gesetze gehören zu dieser Kategorie. Dasselbe gilt auch von der historischen Methode, in dem Sinne, wie sie noch bis jetzt zur Anwendung gelangt. Man mag auch noch so genau den Kausalzusammenhang zwischen einer ganzen Reihe von Begebenheiten und Beziehungen erforschen, zu der Ergründung eines Gesetzes kann solches Verfahren nicht führen, weil der Zusammenhang selbst nur durch zufällige Factoren bestimmt wird. Das hat ja auch Treitschke bewogen, noch vor seinem Tode zu gestehen, dass er keine Gesetzmässigkeit in der Geschichte hat wahrnehmen können. Die statistische und die historische Methoden sind ausserdem vollständig ausser Stande irgend einen Zusammenhang der Gesetzmässigkeit des socialen Geschehens mit derjenigen, die sich in der Natur kund thut, zu statuiren. Die menschliche Gesellschaft und die Natur stellen sich ihnen als zwei ganz verschiedene Sphären dar, die unter einander sich höchstens nur äusserlich berühren. —

Die Anhänger der organischen Methode auf sociologischem Gebiete oder die Organiker, wie sie jetzt von einigen Sociologen benannt werden, haben es sich nun zur Aufgabe gestellt, den Zusammenhang zwischen der Naturkunde und den Socialwissenschaften herzustellen, so wie die Einheitlichkeit der Gesetzmässigkeit in der Natur und der menschlichen Gesellschaft zu

beweisen. Da in jeder Wissenschaft das Mannichfachere und Complicirtere aus dem Einfacheren erklärt wird, so mussten auch die Organiker den festen Grund zum Aufbau ihres wissenschaftlichen Systems in den zunächst liegenden Gebieten der Biologie und der positiven Psychologie suchen. Wie letztere auf Grundlage der Physiologie, diese auf dem Boden der Chemie, letztere auf der Mechanik aufgebaut worden sind, so mussten auch die Biologie und die positive Psychologie den Untergrund für den Aufbau der Sociologie liefern. Die inductive Methode sollte als Leitfaden zum Vergleich der Gesellschaftsorganismen mit den natürlichen dienen. Der berühmte Physiologe Johannes Müller stellte den Satz auf :

Psychologus nemo nisi Physiologus. Die Organiker setzen diesen Ausspruch in den Satz um : Sociologus nemo, nisi biologus.

Die Organiker läugnen nicht die Existenzberechtigung der statistischen, historischen, ja der rein deductiven Methoden, sie sehen aber alle diese Methoden nur als Hilfsmethoden auf dem Gebiete der Sociologie an. Die Sociologie, indem sie die organische Methode gebraucht und die Gesetzmässigkeit der socialen Erscheinungen erforscht, dient ihrerseits gleichfalls als Hilfswissenschaft der Culturgeschichte und Philosophie der Geschichte. Es entsteht eine gegenseitige Hilfsleistung, aber diese ist nur möglich, wenn eine jede Wissenschaft ihr eigenes Gebiet mit den ihr zustehenden Mitteln bearbeitet und sich nicht auf fremden Boden begiebt, wo sie nur Verwirrung anrichten kann. Gebraucht der Sociologe die historische Methode, so wird er zum Culturhistoriker, gebraucht er die statistische, so wird er zum Oekonomisten, versenkt er sich in aprioristisch zusammengestellte allgemeine Anschauungen, so ist er Metaphysiker.

In allen diesen Fällen hört aber der Forscher auf Sociolog zu sein und verliert die Sociologie selbst jegliche Existenzberechtigung. Den Antiorganikern hat es daher die Sociologie zu verdanken, dass ihr wissenschaftlicher Charakter bis jetzt noch bestritten wird und sie als wüster Tummelplatz für allgemeine, aus anderen Gebieten herausgerissene Ideen, Begriffe und Forschungsergebnisse angesehen wird. Nur die Anwendung der organischen Methode kann die Sociologie zur Würde einer selbstständigen Wissenschaft erheben. Nur durch den festen Anschluss an die Naturkunde kann sie den Zweck jeglichen Wissens erreichen : die Begründung der Gesetzmässigkeit der Erscheinungen.

Suchen wir nun zuvörderst die Grenzlinie zu bestimmen, durch welche der Anschluss des Gebietes der Sociologie an das der Naturkunde bezeichnet werden soll. —

Der Hr. Professor Max Verworn definirt in seinem bahnbrechenden Werke : Allgemeine Physiologie*) den biologischen Begriff des Individuums auf folgende Weise:

„Ein organisches Individuum ist eine einheitliche Masse lebendiger Substanz, welche unter bestimmten äusseren Lebensbedingungen selbsterhaltungsfähig ist.“

Diese Definition wendet nun Hr. M. Verworn zunächst auf alle einzelne freilebende Organismen in der Form, wie sie in der Natur vorkommen, an. „Aber“, fügt er hinzu, „die Definition umfasst noch mehr als nur räumlich zusammenhängende Organismen ; sie umfasst zusammengehörige Gruppen von einzelnen Organismen, deren jeder von anderen zwar räumlich getrennt sein kann, die aber alle zusammen eine Einheit bilden.“ Als Beispiel dafür führt der Hr. Verfasser den Ameisenstaat an, in dem die einzelnen Theile, wie die Glieder eines Organismus, einheitlich zusammenwirken. Der ganze Unterschied zwischen einem Korallenstock und einem Ameisenhaufen besteht, nach Hrn. Verworn, nur darin, dass im ersteren die Individuen niederer Ordnung substantiell zusammenhängen, wogegen sie im Ameisenstaate räumlich getrennt sind.

Dieser Definition des Individuums wird zweifelsohne ein jeder tieferblickende Naturforscher beistimmen und hier findet sich auch der Anschluss der Sociologie an die Ergebnisse der Biologie.

Das Individuum Ameisenstaat besteht aus solchen Zellenelementen, die bereits als Personen

*) S. 61.

bezeichnet werden können. Aber es stellt doch immer noch ein Collectivlebewesen dar, das auf sehr niedriger Entwicklungsstufe stehen geblieben ist und solches scheinbar für alle Zukunft. Die den Ameisenstaat bildenden Personen wirken nur nach bestimmten instinctmässigen Normen, die sie zu überschreiten nicht im Stande sind.

Welche organischen Bildungen schliessen sich nun am nächsten den Thierstaaten ? — Das sind die von Menschen gebildeten Staaten, welche ihre Erhebung über das Niveau der Thierstaaten der ihnen innewohnenden Fähigkeit zu einer allmählig fortschreitender Entwicklung zu verdanken haben. Wie die physiologische Nothwendigkeit, nach welcher die Zelle im Einzelorganismus wirkt, sich im Thierstaat zum Instinkt ausgeprägt hat, so hat sich letzterer in der menschlichen Gesellschaft zum bewussten Wirken der den Staat bildenden Personen erhoben. Aber wie zwischen Mensch und Thier nur ein gradueller Unterschied vorliegt, so kann es auch zwischen einem Menschen- und Thierstaat auch nur eine graduelle Differenz geben. Ist es nun bewiesen, dass der Thierstaat ein Individuum darstellt, so muss auch der Menschenstaat als Individuum, oder, was dasselbe bedeutet, als ein realer Organismus aufgefasst werden. — Ob die einzelnen Staaten sich noch zu einem höheren Gesamtorganismus, der die ganze Menschheit umschliessen wird, vereinigen werden, bleibt der Zukunft vorbehalten. Bei dem jetzigen Stadium der Cultur stellt der Staat noch die höchst potencirte Einheit in dem Zusammenwirken der Menschen dar. Aber Alles, was wir auf den Staat in unseren Auseinandersetzungen beziehen, findet seine Anwendung auch auf losere sociale Verbände in ebenso realem, wenn auch beschränkterem Sinne.

Herr Max Verworn unterscheidet in der Organismenwelt, gleich mehreren anderen Naturforschern, fünf verschiedene Individualitätsordnungen : die Zellen als Elementarorganismen ; die Gewebe, die aus Zellen bestehen ; die Organe, die von Geweben gebildet werden ; die Personen, die eine Vereinigung von Organen darstellen; endlich die Staaten, die aus Verbänden von Personen bestehen*). Jede höhere Ordnung von Individuen schliesst dabei hierarchisch alle niedere Ordnungen in sich. Daher stellen auch die Personen die einen Staat bilden, nicht ein einfaches Nebeneinander dar, denn sonst würden sie, gleich den Bäumen eines Waldes, den Halmen eines Feldes, den zufällig zusammengelaufenen Thieren einer Heerde, keine höhere Individualität, keinen Organismus bilden. Das einheitliche Zusammenwirken wird im Staate dadurch erreicht, dass die einzelnen Personen ihre Thätigkeit gemeinschaftlichen Zwecken widmen und unterordnen. Eine solche Vereinheitlichung im Wirken kann nur durch ein hierarchisch potencirtes und differencirtes Uebereinander der den Staat bildenden Elemente erreicht werden. Im Ameisen- und Bienenstaat findet dieses Uebereinander in der Gruppierung und Differencirung der staatsbildenden Personenelemente in arbeitende, nicht arbeitende oder nur specielle Arbeiten verrichtende, in herrschende und dienende Klassen seinen Ausdruck. Im Bienenstaat wird die Vereinheitlichung sogar durch eine Centralperson, die Bienenkönigin, in gewisser Hinsicht veranschaulicht. Im Menschenstaate vereinigen sich die einzelnen Personen gleichfalls zunächst zu einfacheren Verbänden, wie Familie, Clan. Diese wachsen zu complicirteren Bildungen zusammen, wie Tribe, Völkerschaft, verschiedenartige wirthschaftliche Gemeinschaften. Endlich entwickeln sich aus denselben die gleichfalls aus Personen bestehenden höheren, herrschenden Klassen so wie die Centralorgane, durch welche die Staatseinheit repräsentirt wird. Im Menschenstaate wiederholt sich also derselbe hierarchische Aufbau, durch welchen auch in den niederen Ordnungen der Organismen die Individualität hergestellt wird : die Personen entsprechen den Zellen, die einfacheren socialen Verbände den Geweben, die complicirteren den Organen, die Staatsgewalten den Centralorganen. In den pflanzlichen und thierischen Einzelorganismen ist die unmittelbare Berührung der die Gewebe und Organe bildenden Zellen nur eine scheinbare. Es existirt in der Natur kein absolut undurchdringlicher

*) S. 64.

Körper, daher auch keine unmittelbare Zusammenfügung von Elementen sogar in den härtesten Körpern. Es kann sich in dieser Hinsicht immer nur um ein Mehr oder Weniger von Raumverhältnissen handeln. Die gasförmigen Körper bestehen aus Molekülen, die von einander weiter abstehen als diejenigen, durch welche flüssige Substanzen gebildet werden; diese bestehen wiederum aus Molekülen, die in grösserer Entfernung auf einander wirken als diejenigen der festen Körper, aber alle bilden sie doch immer nur Körper.

Ganz ebenso stellt ein jeder Menschenstaat ein Individuum dar gleich einem Bienen- und Ameisenstaat, und letzterer ein Individuum gleich einem Zellenstaate, obgleich die Raumverhältnisse, in denen die Vereinheitlichung bewirkt wird, sehr verschiedene sind. Im Einzelorganismus ist die bereits differencirte Zelle wohl fester an bestimmte Gewebe und Organe gebunden, als die Personen im Staate. Eine Zelle kann nicht aus dem Knochengerüste in's Muskelgewebe oder in's Nervensystem hinüberwandern; ihre Differencirung ist eine einseitige, definitiv abgeschlossene. Es giebt jedoch auch in den Einzelorganismen Wanderzellen, wie die rothen Blutkörperchen, die Leukocyten, die Spermatozoen. Die einen Staat bildenden Personen sind meistentheils Wanderzellen, aber sie sind auch zugleich psychologisch mehr oder weniger differencirte Zellen und daher auch gleich den Zellen an bestimmte Familien, Klassen und Ordnungen im Staate gebunden. In dem Kasten- und Sklavenstaate ist dieser Verband ein festerer, in dem freien Staate ein loserer. Absolute Freiheit giebt es aber in dem einen ebenso wenig wie in dem anderen.

Der Unterschied zwischen den verschiedenen Ordnungen von Individualitäten wird also, dem Wesen nach, nicht durch Raumoder Zeitverhältnisse bestimmt, sondern durch ungleiche Potencirungen von Energieen bewirkt. Das Zusammenwirken der Zellen in den Einzelorganismen wird lediglich durch mechanische, chemische und physiologische Energieen bedingt ; im Thierstaate thun sich diese Energieen als Instinkt kund ; im Menschenstaate potencirt sich der Instinkt allmählig zu einem halbbewussten und schliesslich zu einem bewussten Zusammenleben, zu einem Zusammenfühlen, -denken und -wollen.

Ein jedes menschliche Individuum stellt, abgesehen von seinem rein physischen Organismus, noch ein vom Urmenschen an im socialen Leben aufgespeichertes und von den Vorfahren ererbtes Kapital von psychophysischen Energieen dar, das ihn zum Zusammenfühlen, -denken und -wollen mit Seinesgleichen befähigt. Dieses Kapital ist gleich seinen rein physischen Anlagen eine Erbschaft, daher ist jeder Mensch schon durch seine Abstammung an eine bestimmte Familie, Race, Nationalität gebunden. Das ererbte psychophysische Capital ist aber zugleich auch ein durch das sociale Leben früherer Generationen differencirtes Capital von bestimmten geistigen, ethischen, ästhetischen Anlagen, Fähigkeiten und Entwicklungsstufen. Durch die Erziehung kann wohl das ererbte Capital weiter entwickelt und anders differencirt werden, aber eine jede Erziehung bearbeitet doch immer nur bereits vorhandenes Material an latenten psychischen Energieen. Ein Hausthier kann nur zu einer sehr niedrigen Stufe von Intelligenz erhoben und nur zu einem sehr engen Kreise von Verrichtungen erzogen werden ; desgleichen der Repräsentant einer niederen Race. Daher ist auch ein jedes Individuum nicht blos durch seine Abstammung an bestimmte Verbände gebunden, sondern es ist auch durch seine ererbten psychischen Anlagen, so wie durch seine Erziehung auf bestimmte Verrichtungen im socialen Leben angewiesen. Dieses durch Abstammung, Vererbung und Erziehung bedingte Uebereinander bildet gerade die Grundlage jeglichen Staatslebens, des Ursowie des Culturstaates.

Auch auf den höchsten Stufen der Cultur werden aber stets neben den höheren, psychischen, auch die niederen : die mechanischen, chemischen, physiologischen, instinctiven Energieen sowohl im Staate, als auch im Leben des Individuums wirksam sein. Der Mensch wird sich als Erdenbewohner nie seiner Herkunft aus anorganischem Stoff und organischer Materie entäussern können. Er wird stets seinen physischen Bedürfnissen durch materielle Mittel Befriedigung verschaffen müssen. Die dazu nöthige Arbeitsleistung kann er freilich, nach Massgabe seiner culturellen Entwicklung, auf das umgebende Medium hinüberwälzen (Maschinen,

Transportmittel, Culinarkunst etc.), aber zum Nullpunkt mechanischer, chemischer und physiologischer persönlicher Arbeit und materiellen Werthverbrauchs wird er es nicht bringen. So wird auch der höchst entwickelte Culturstaat stets von materiellen Mitteln in seiner Existenz und Entwicklung abhängig sein. —

Die Abhängigkeit des Menschen von der Materie bekundet sich nicht blos in Hinsicht auf die Befriedigung seiner physischen Bedürfnisse, sondern gleichfalls bei der Entwicklung der psychischen Anlagen und Fähigkeiten. Die Capitalisirung und Auslösung der psychischen Energieen wird stets von mechanischen, chemischen, physiologischen Processen in dem individuellen Nervensystem begleitet, dessen Molekularbestandtheile dabei verändert und umgeformt werden. Es bilden sich neue Gewebe und Organe, niedere zu höheren bei fortschreitender Entwicklung; höhere atrophiren sich zu niederen bei rückschreitender Bewegung. Im Verlaufe der ganzen Geschichte der Menschheit haben sich auf diesem Wege die vorzugsweise im Gehirn des Menschen concentrirten höheren Nervenorgane allmählig ausgebildet und sind von Generation zu Generation durch allmählig wachsende Aufspeicherung von latenten psychischen Energieen der späteren Nachkommenschaft überliefert worden. Diese höheren Nervenorgane, die materiellen Träger der geistigen, ethischen und ästhetischen Anlagen und Fähigkeiten des menschlichen Individuums, sind ein Product des socialen Lebens und bilden ihrerseits auch die Lebensquelle auf die jegliches Zusammenwirken in der Gesellschaft zurückzuführen ist.

Suchen wir uns nun nähere Rechenschaft darüber abzugeben, durch welche Mittel und Wege die Capitalisirung und Auslösung der psychischen Energieen im Schoosse der Gesellschaft bewerkstelligt werden.

Abgesehen von dem eigentlichen Geburtsact, von der in der frühesten Kindheit nothwendigen Körperpflege und von einigen rein conventionellen Gebräuchen, wie Händedruck, Kuss und dergleichen, kann der Culturmensch Jahrzehnte sich in der Gesellschaft bewegen, ohne in mechanische Berührung mit Seinesgleichen, es sei denn nur zufällig, zu gerathen. Und dennoch steht er in beständiger reger Wechselwirkung mit den anderen Gliedern der Gesellschaft. Die Mittel, durch welche diese Wechselwirkung bewerkstelligt wird, können hauptsächlich unter drei Kategorieen zusammengefasst werden : Wort, Schrift, Kunstproduct, letzteres in seiner umfassendsten Bedeutung. Durch die Sprache und einige Kunstleistungen, wie z. B. die Musik, werden vermittelt Schwingungen der Luftmoleküle unsere Hörnerven erregt ; durch Schriftzeichen und die Producte der plastischen Künste : Bauten, Monumente, Statuen, Gemälde werden unsere Sehnerven vermittelt Schwingungen des Aethers in Erregung gesetzt. Auf unsere höheren äusseren Sinne : das Ohr und das Auge übt das uns umgebende physische Medium einen bestimmten Reiz. Der Begriff des Reizes ist in der Biologie ein weitgehender. Jede Einwirkung äusserer Factoren auf einen Organismus kann in einem gewisse Sinne als Reiz angesehen werden.

Worin besteht nun aber die Reizwirkung ?

Jede lebendige Substanz besitzt die Fähigkeit gegen äussere Reize zu reagiren, wobei ein Umsatz und eine Störung im molekularen und dynamischen Gleichgewicht ihrer inneren Bestandtheile vor sich gehen. Eine solche Reizwirkung rufen auch die durch Wort, Schrift, Kunstproduct und -leistung hervorgebrachten Erregungen unserer äusseren Sinne, in unseren inneren höheren Nervenorganen hervor. Letztere reagiren ihrerseits gegen die äusseren Reize, indem sie die in ihnen angehäuften latenten Energieen auslösen und ihre Molekularbestandtheile umsetzen.

Nun existirt aber sowohl in der anorganischen Natur als auch in der Organismenwelt kein bestimmtes Verhältniss zwischen der Qualität und Intensität des Reizes und der Reizwirkung. Ein leiser mechanischer Stoss kann eine ungeheure chemische Reizwirkung hervorbringen, wie solches z. B. bei allen Sprengstoffen der Fall ist und umgekehrt bei starken äusserlichen Reizmitteln kann die Reizwirkung ganz ausbleiben, wie z. B. bei Annäherung eines Magnets an ein Stück Holz etc.

Bei der psychophysischen Wechselwirkung zwischen den Menschen in der Gesellschaft tritt dieses Missverhältniss zwischen Reiz und Reizwirkung noch greller hervor. Wenn ein in einem geschlossenen Raume versammeltes Publicum das Wort Feuer! ausstossen hört, so drängt es sich massenweise zu den Ausgängen, bei denen ein Kampf um Leben und Tod entsteht. Dem Einen lähmt der Schreck die Glieder und macht das Blut in den Adern stocken, die Anderen suchen sich durch Schreien und Toben Luft zu machen, indem sie eine ungewöhnliche Muskelkraft entwickeln. Das einzige Wort Feuer! hat auf diese Versammlung eine ebenso grosse Wirkung hervorgebracht, wie ein angezündetes Streichhölzchen auf ein Pulvermagazin, durch dessen Explosion eine ganze volkreiche Stadt zerstört worden ist. Dort genügte eine leichte Contraction der Muskelfasern des Halses und der Zunge, hier eine leise Bewegung der Hand um die Wirkungen hervorzubringen. Die nach allen Weltgegenden durch Telegramme und Zeitungen versandte Nachricht über die Kriegserklärung zwischen zwei Grossmächten setzt die Gemüther zahlreicher Bevölkerungen in Erregung ; der Handel stockt, es entsteht eine rege Dislocation ungeheurer Truppenmassen u. s. w. und solches nur in Folge momentaner Schwingungen des Aethers auf die Sehnerven. Eine solche Reizwirkung lässt sich nur durch das grossartige Capital psychophysischer Energieen erklären, die in jedem Individuum und in jeder Gesellschaft als Collectivindividuum aufgespeichert sind. Das Auslösen solcher latenter psychophysischer Energieen kann eine Verminderung des Capitals, aber auch eine Vergrösserung desselben durch einen gleichzeitigen oder nachfolgenden Umsatz der Moleküle in den höheren Nervenorganen zur Folge haben. Lese ich ein erbauliches Buch, ein klar durchdachtes philosophisches Werk, höre ich eine schöne Melodie an, betrachte ich ein harmonisch durchgeführtes Kunstwerk, so wird die Reizwirkung in mir auch durch Auslösen psychophysischer Energieen begleitet, aber in Folge der gleichzeitig verursachten dynamisch werthvolleren Umbildung meiner höheren Nervenorgane werde ich mich zugleich gekräftigt und gehoben fühlen. Ein entgegengesetztes Resultat würde die Lectüre einer unmoralischen Schrift, eines verworrenen philosophischen Systems, das Hören einer disharmonischen Musik, das Betrachten eines geschmacklosen Kunstwerks abgeben.

Setzen wir nun aber voraus, dass das Wort Feuer, so wie die Nachricht wegen der Kriegserklärung in einer Sprache abgefasst sind, die Niemand verstehen kann. Dann fällt die Reizwirkung ganz weg. Eine Rede die Niemand anhört, ein Manuscript oder ein Buch, die Niemand gelesen hat, eine Kunstverrichtung ohne Zeugen, ein Gemälde das Niemand betrachtet hat, stellen daher als Reizmittel betrachtet nur todte Materie, zwecklose Leistungen dar, es sei denn, dass man sie als nützliche Kraftübungen des Producenten selbst in Anschlag bringt.

Aus dem Vorhergehenden folgt, dass eine Cultur nur insofern von wirklichem und wesentlichem Werth ist, als das menschliche Individuum, das als lebendes Element alle socialen Gewebe, Organe und den Staat bildet, durch die Cultur geistig entwickelt, moralisch, gebessert, ästhetisch gehoben, physisch gesunder gemacht wird.

Durch eine in's Grenzenlose gehende Production und Anhäufung von Werthgegenständen, die nur Sachen darstellen, namentlich bei einer unregelmässigen und ungeordneten Vertheilung derselben zwischen den Mitgliedern und Klassen der Gesellschaft, werden die Culturzwecke lange noch nicht erreicht. Das haben wir in unserer „Socialen Pathologie“*) näher begründet und ausführlicher auseinandergesetzt, indem wir die in der Gesellschaft circulirenden Güter in positive, negative und neutrale Gebrauchswerthe eintheilten. Setzen wir nun noch hinzu, dass dieser unser Standpunkt vollständig mit den Grundlagen des Christenthums übereinstimmt, welches hauptsächlich die Besserung der Persönlichkeit sich zur Aufgabe stellt, und das Wort, das nicht zum Herzen geht, das Sacrament das mit Gleichgültigkeit entgegengenommen wird, den Glauben, der nicht

*) La Pathologie Sociale, Bd. II der Bibliotheque sociologique internationale.

lebendig macht, für werthlos erklärt*).

Stellt man einen Vergleich an zwischen der Wechselwirkung der Personen im socialen Organismus und den Processen, durch welche unser Körper belebt wird, so wird man finden, dass jene zunächst der Wechselwirkung der Zellen im Nervensystem und speciell in den höheren Organen desselben, die als materielle Träger des individuellen Fühlens, Denkens und Wollens sich kund thun, analog ist. Die Nervenzellen erregen sich auch gegenseitig durch Reize, differenciren sich und potenciren sich gegenseitig zu specifischen Geweben und Organen, häufen dabei psychophysische Euergieen an und lösen bereits früher capitalisirte aus. Eine jede Zelle des individuellen Nervensystems hat sich stufenweise, biogenetisch, durch eine unermessliche Reihe sich stets gegenseitig differencirender und potencirender Zellengemeinschaften, durch Anpassung an das innere, organische Medium, durch Kampf um's Dasein, Selection und Vererbung, in Folge einer beständigen gegenseitigen Reizwirkung, zu den functionellen Fähigkeiten und histologischen Bildungen des specifischen Nervengewebes und Organes, zu dem sie gehört, erhoben. So ist auch der Urmensch, als Theil realer Gesammtheiten, als Zellenelement sich stets umformender socialer Systeme, auf demselben Wege historisch, durch eine unermessliche Reihe zusammenführender, -denkender und -wollender Generationen zum Culturmenschen geworden.

Die zwischen den Zellen, Geweben und Organen des Körpers durch Nervenreiz hervorgerufene Erregung wird in der Biologie und Psychologie als Reflex bezeichnet. Seinem Wesen nach besteht auch jegliches Zusammenleben und -wirken der Menschen im gesellschaftlichen Verbande in beständigen Reflexwirkungen. In der Psychologie werden wohl zunächst die automatisch vor sich gehenden Reizwirkungen im individuellen Nervensystem unter dem Begriffe Reflex verstanden. Aber der Unterschied zwischen automatischen, halbbewussten und bewussten Wirkungen ist ein fließender. Daher wird von den neueren Psychologen der Begriff des Reflexes auf jegliche Wechselwirkung der Gewebe und Organe durch Nervenreiz ausgedehnt. Aber im socialen Organismus gesellen sich, in Folge der grösseren Beweglichkeit und Autonomie der einzelnen Zellenelemente, zu den im individuellen Nervensysteme durch Nervenfasern vermittelten directen Reflexe, noch indirecte, durch Schrift, Kunstproduction etc. vermittelte Reflexe. Dass die Wirkungen der indirecten Reflexe ihrem Wesen nach identisch sind mit denen der directen, geht, unabhängig von dem bereits oben Angeführten, noch daraus klar hervor, dass sie gegenseitig in einander umgesetzt werden können, ohne dass das Resultat der Wirkung eine Aenderung erfährt. Die Nachricht über den Tod eines Verwandten oder Freundes wirkt gleich erschütternd, ob man sie durch directe Zeichen, mündlich, von Person zu Person oder vermittelt eines Briefes oder Telegramms, also durch indirecte Reflexe, erhalten hat. Und der Energiewechsel der Ganglienzellen unseres Gehirns, des dem socialen Organismus zunächst stehenden natürlichen Zellenstaates, bietet gleichfalls einen Innervationsmodus dar, der den Uebergangsprocess vom directen zum indirecten Reflex kennzeichnet. Es ist nämlich neuerdings beobachtet worden, dass die Dendriten (Verzweigungen der Ganglienzellen) einer Ganglienzelle mit den Nervenfasern (Fortsätzen) der anderen, auf die sie einen Reiz ausübten, nicht substantiell zusammenhängen, sondern dass zwischen ihnen noch ein Spaltstück sich befindet. Der Energiewechsel zwischen den Ganglienzellen geht also in diesem Falle vor sich, obgleich ein unmittelbarer Austausch von Substanz gar nicht stattfindet, sondern nur eine Berührung zwischen den Dendriten und Nervenfasern durch Vermittelung eines Spaltstückes.

Zu einem vollständigen sogenannten Reflexbogen gehört ein centrales Verbindungsstück zwischen dem percipirenden und auf den Reiz reagirenden Elemente. Der Reflexbogen in seiner Vollständigkeit erscheint im Staate, wenn z. B. ein Reiz bis zu den centralen Organen, die

*) Siehe unsere Gedanken über die Socialwissenschaft der Zukunft, Bd. V : Versuch einer natürlichen Theologie S. 65 u. ff.

Regierung, gelangt und eine Reaction von derselben durch verschiedene Massnahmen, Befehle etc. erfolgt. Aber auch bei der Wechselwirkung einzelner Glieder und Gruppen der Gesellschaft unter einander behalten die Reize den Charakter von Reflexen, indem auch bei ihnen die Hauptmomente des Processes : Empfangen eines Reizes durch sinnliche Wahrnehmung, Reagiren gegen denselben durch Auslösung psychophysischer Energieen, Bildung neuer Molekulordnungen, Bindung neuer dynamischer Elemente, stattfindet. — Um Benennungen und Worte lässt sich viel streiten. Von grosser Wichtigkeit für die Sociologie wäre jedoch die Feststellung und Annahme einer Terminologie, die bereits ihrem Wortlaute nach auf den Zusammenhang zwischen der Sociologie und der allgemeinen Biologie, sowie der positiven Psychologie hindeuten würde. Den Versuch zu einer solchen Terminologie haben wir in unseren vorhergehenden Werken gemacht. Eine Wissenschaft, die über keine bestimmte Terminologie verfügt, wird sich nie definitiv construiren können und wird auch nie als selbstständige Wissenschaft anerkannt werden. Ein jeder Forscher wird seinen, auf subjectiven Anschauungen begründeten Wortschatz in das zu erforschende Gebiet hineinragen und zu endlosen Wörtstreitigkeiten Veranlassung geben. Auch eine dem Wesen des Objects der Forschung entsprechende Classification der Erscheinungen ist ohne feste Terminologie nicht möglich. Ein jeder Forscher wird mit seinem Wortschatze auch eine neue Classification in die Wissenschaft hineinragen. In allen Zweigen der Naturkunde wird bereits durch die Terminologie der zu erforschenden Erscheinungen auf ihren Zusammenhang mit denjenigen, die zu den nächsten und namentlich den niederen und einfacheren Wissensgebieten gehören, hingewiesen. Dieser Regel glauben wir gerecht geworden zu sein, indem wir die Wechselwirkung der Individuen im socialen Leben als Reflexwirkung bezeichnet haben.

Aus demselben Grunde haben wir auch den socialen Organismus als ein Nervensystem bezeichnet. Zwischen den Worten System und Körper wird in der Biologie kein Unterschied gemacht. Unser Körper besteht aus verschiedenen Systemen von Zellen, Geweben und Organen, dem Knochengerüste, dem Muskel-, dem vasomotorischen, dem Nervensysteme, und sie alle bilden denselben Körper. Das Wort System wäre zur Bezeichnung des socialen Organismus insofern vorzuziehen, als es auf den loseren mechanischen Zusammenhang der einzelnen Elemente unter einander hinweist. So bilden die Weltkörper, die um die Sonne kreisen, gleichfalls ein System. Der Unterschied ist jedoch, wie wir bereits oben angedeutet haben, kein wesentlicher, sondern nur ein relativer. Unser Sonnensystem würde einem Beobachter, der sich in der Ferne der Milchstrasse befinden würde, möglicher Weise, wie diese, als ein einzelner gasförmiger oder leuchtender Körper erscheinen.

Dem socialen Nervensystem haben wir, in Analogie der im Körper vorhandenen noch nicht assimilirten Nahrungsstoffe und Schutzvorrichtungen und der bereits von den Zellen, Geweben und Organen ausgeschiedenen Substanzen, die sociale Zwischenzellensubstanz gegenübergestellt. Im weiteren Sinne gehören zu dieser alle nutzbaren Güter : Boden, Gewässer, die Atmosphäre, überhaupt das physische Medium, in welchem die einzelnen Elemente des socialen Organismus eingebettet sind und sich bewegen. Im engeren Sinne gehören zur socialen Zwischenzellensubstanz alle in der Gesellschaft circulirenden Werthgegenstände, die von den Individuen behufs Befriedigung ihrer Bedürfnisse verbraucht werden, gleich wie die Pflanzen die in ihnen circulirenden Säfte und die Thiere ihre Nahrung assimiliren.

Die Gegner der organischen Methode verwechseln stets die Zwischenzellsubstanz, die nur leblose Substanzen, also Sachen, in sich schliesst, mit den lebendigen Elementen des socialen Organismus, die nur durch Personen repräsentirt werden und aus denen das sociale Nervensystem gebildet wird. Daher setzen sich die Antiorganiker ein vollständig verworrenes Bild vom socialen Organismus zusammen und schöpfen aus dem Wirrwarr ihrer eigenen Anschauungen ihre Widerlegungen. Sie behaupten nämlich, das., die Organiker die Telegraphendrähte mit den Nerven, die Eisenbahnstationen mit ebenso viel Herzen, die dem socialen Organismus eigen sein

sollen, identificiren. Die Telegraphendrähte, die Eisenbahnen mit allen ihren Baulichkeiten sind Sachen, sie können nur als Gebrauchswerthe von dem socialen Nervensysteme zu verschiedenen Zwecken benutzt werden, sie sind aber unfähig selbst eine lebende Substanz zu bilden. Auf der socialen Zwischenzellensubstanz projectiren sich die Thätigkeitsäusserungen des Individuums und der Gesellschaft, gleichwie auch die Pflanze und das Thier die ihnen zu Gebote stehenden Nahrungs- und Schutzmittel erst mechanisch, morphologisch und physiologisch bearbeiten ehe sie dieselben assimiliren oder verbrauchen. So ist denn auch jedes aus Werthgegenständen bestehende angehäuften Capital immer nur ein todtes bis die in demselben enthaltenen Energieen von den Personen assimilirt werden. Das todtte Kapital, als Theil der Zwischenzellensubstanz, stellt nur eine Projection der in den Personen angehäuften psychophysischen Energieen dar. Die Widerlegungen der Antiorganiker sind also in dieser Hinsicht nur als Schläge in's Wasser anzusehen.

Eine jede Auslösung von mechanischen, chemischen und psychophysischen Energieen setzt eine vorhergegangene Aufspeicherung derselben voraus. Wir haben gesehen, über welch' ein grossartiges Capital von latenten psychischen Energieen ein jeder Mensch, besonders aber der Culturmensch, verfügt. Durch welchen Process ist dieses Capital angehäuften worden ?

Der Urmensch verfügte nur über einige halbarticulirte Laute um seinen Gefühlen und Gedanken Ausdruck zu verleihen ; er bediente sich seiner eigenen Glieder, um durch äussere Zeichen seinen Willen zu kennzeichnen ; er kannte nur die ersten Zahlen und rechnete mit den Fingern der Hände und Füsse ; seine Waffen waren ungeschliffene Steine und Holzkeulen ; die Tonkunst bestand in einem wüsten Lärm machen, die Tanzkunst in einem Springen und Gehen im Tact ; alle übrigen Künste dienten fast ausschliesslich nur zur Befriedigung der dringendsten physischen Bedürfnisse. Aber schon damals implicirten diese ursprünglichen Thätigkeitsäusserungen sociale Reflexwirkungen, durch welche die Glieder der Urgesellschaft allmählig zu höherem Denken, Fühlen und Wollen angeregt wurden; schon damals wurde der Grund zur Bildung derjenigen Nervenorgane gelegt, aus denen die spätere Culturfähigkeit des Menschen sich entwickelte. Eine jede Generation der aufstrebenden Elemente der Urbevölkerungen that in der Richtung der intensiveren Reflexwirkung einen Schritt vorwärts und vererbte die erhöhte Culturfähigkeit in der Form höher entwickelter Nervenorgane der nächsten Nachkommenschaft. Dementsprechend wuchsen nicht nur immer mehr durch neue Aufschichtungen von latenten psychophysischen Energieen diejenigen Organe, die man als die socialen bezeichnen kann, weil sie ein Product des socialen Lebens sind, sondern sie entwickelten sich auch mit jeder Generation früher als in der vorhergehenden um einer neuen Aufschichtung Zeit und Raum zu gewähren. Auf diesem Process der allmählichen Aufschichtung und Verdichtung der höheren Organe, die vorzugsweise im menschlichen Gehirn vereinigt sind, beruht das Gesetz der abgekürzten Wiederholung im Individuum der ganzen Culturgeschichte der Menschheit. Dieses Gesetz, das wir als das centrale socialembryologische Gesetz gekennzeichnet haben, entspricht vollständig dem allgemeinen embryologischen Gesetze, welches sich in der ganzen Organismenwelt kund thut. Der psychophysische Entwicklungsgang eines jeden einzelnen menschlichen Individuums giebt somit dem Culturhistoriker den Faden in die Hand, um die ganze Geschichte der Menschheit zu erforschen. Das socialembryologische Entwicklungsgesetz müsste als Grundlage für jegliche Culturgeschichte dienen. Aber es steht auf der Grenzscheide zwischen der Biologie und den politischen Wissenschaften in ihrem jetzigen Entwicklungsstadium. Daher wird dieses sociologische Grundgesetz fast vollständig übersehen. Die Biologen sind keine Sociologen und die Oekonomen, Juristen und Politiker keine Biologen. Nur einige hervorragende Geister in Deutschland, wie Roscher, Hellwald, Schäffle haben dieses Gesetz nach seinem vollen wissenschaftlichen Werthe gewürdigt.

Das Kind von heute stellt dem eben angeführten socialembryologischen Gesetze gemäss in realer Form, durch den Bau seines Gehirns, die Entwicklungsstufe dar, auf welcher die Menschheit sich in ihrer frühesten Jugend befand. Die höheren, socialen Nervenorgane sind in ihrer Entwicklung so weit vorausgeeilt, dass das Kind von heute, bei völlig noch unentwickeltem physischen Organismus bereits in den ersten Jahren seines Lebens über diejenige geistige und ethische Energieen verfügt, die der Urmensch nur bei voller Reife erlangte.

Das Kind fasst die äusseren Eindrücke unbewusst oder halbbewusst auf ; es neigt zur Nachahmung ; es bearbeitet nicht selbstständig die von aussen auf ihn wirkenden Reize. Im Kinde verbreiten sich vom Ohr und Auge ausgehende Reflexe sogleich über das ganze Nervensystem und setzen fast alle Muskeln des Körpers in Bewegung. Das Kind ist nicht im Stande sich dabei zu beherrschen ; es giebt sich sogleich, ganz und gar, dem ersten stärkeren Eindruck hin. Hell leuchtende Körper, grelle Farben, lautschmetternde Töne ziehen vorzüglich seine Aufmerksamkeit an. Unwillkürliche Bewegungen und unbezwungene Empfindungen, d. h. die Leidenschaftlichkeit ist im Kinde viel stärker, als im Erwachsenen, zugleich aber auch viel flüchtiger, indem das Kind unmittelbar unter dem Einflusse der wechselnden äusseren Eindrücke und Erscheinungen steht. Das menschliche Gehirn ist ein Apparat, der die von aussen kommenden Reflexe fixirt und verarbeitet. Bei grösserer Ausbildung dieses Apparats giebt sich der Mensch nicht mehr unwillkürlich und unverzüglich dem äusseren Eindruck, der willenslosen Empfindung, dem blinden Triebe hin. Er handelt nach Massgabe seiner socialen Entwicklung immer subjectiv bewusster und objectiv selbstständiger.

Sehen wir uns den jetzigen Wilden an, so finden wir, dass die psychischen Energieen, über die er verfügt, gleichartige mit denen des Kindes der höheren Raten sind. Der Wille steht also heute noch in Hinsicht auf die Ausbildung seiner socialen Nervenorgane, vielleicht nur wenige Stufen höher als der Urmensch. Die heute noch existirenden wilden Völkerschaften stellen also in ihrer socialen Entwicklung zurückgebliebene Zweige eines gemeinschaftlichen Stammes dar, von welchem aus auch der Culturmensch sich zu höheren Stufen emporgeschwungen hat. Die Zwischenstufen werden durch die noch jetzt lebenden Völkerschaften, die dem mythologischen und heroischen Zeitalter in der Geschichte entsprechen, repräsentirt. Diese geschichtlichen Epochen entsprechen dem Jünglingsalter des modernen Culturmenschen. Es stehen also drei Reihenfolgen psychologischen Geschehens vor uns: die psychophysische individuelle Entwicklung des modernen Culturmenschen vom Kinde bis zum reifen Alter ; der geschichtliche Entwicklungsgang vom Urmenschen bis zum Culturmenschen, mit den noch jetzt durch die wilden, halbwilden und barbarischen Volksstämme bezeichneten Stufen dieser psychologischen Evolution ; endlich die Entwicklung der Gesellschaft als ein Complex socialen Systeme. Auf diesen drei Reihen eines und desselben ununterbrochenen Entwicklungsprocesses des individuellen, geschichtlichen und socialen gründet sich nun das Gesetz des dreifachen Parallelismus und der Uebereinstimmung des Nach-, Neben- und Uebereinander des socialen Werdens, das dem allgemeinen in der ganzen Organismenwelt gültigen Gesetze des dreifachen Parallelismus der ontogenetischen philetischen und systematischen Entwicklung entspricht. Zu welchen, specifischen Thätigkeitsäusserungen und Gestaltungen in der ökonomischen (physiologischen), juridischen (morphologischen) und hierarchisch-politischen (vereinheitlichenden) Sphäre des socialen Lebens dieses allgemeine Gesetz führt und durch welche Anomalieen es bedingt wird, haben wir in unseren früheren Werken auseinandergesetzt *).

Das ganze Menschengeschlecht stellt einen Baum dar, dessen Wurzel in die Thierwelt

*) Gedanken über die Socialwissenschaft der Zukunft : Bd. I Die Menschliche Gesellschaft als realer Organismus ; Bd. II Die socialen Gesetze ; Bd. III Die sociale Psychophysik ; Bd. IV Die sociale Physiologie ; Bd. V Versuch einer natürlichen Theologie.

ragen, dessen Stamm der Urmensch gebildet hat und dessen nach allen Richtungen auseinandergehenden und zu verschiedenen Höhen hinaufgeschossenen Zweige noch heute durch die auf verschiedenen Culturstufen stehenden Völkerschaften und Racen repräsentirt werden. Die Blätter dieses riesigen Baumes sind die Individuen; aber die menschlichen Individuen haben sich nicht, wie die Blätter einer Pflanze, isolirt von einander gehalten, nur durch Abstammung sich an den allgemeinen Stamm knüpfend, sondern sie sind unter einander stets in Wechselwirkung getreten und haben dadurch ihre weitere Entwicklung befördert. Die jetzt lebenden Individuen gehören zu verschiedenen in früheren Perioden der Geschichte aus einander gegangenen Zweigen, aber in der Vergangenheit müssen stets Zeitmomente und Punkte gewesen sein, an welchen sie an einen gemeinschaftlichen Hauptzweig oder an dem ursprünglichen Stamm gleichzeitig zusammenliefen. Auf dieser Einheit der Abstammung beruht die Gemeinschaftlichkeit der physischen und psychischen Grundanlagen aller Menschen. Aber würden die einzelnen Zweige und Blätter einfach aus einander gelaufen sein, so würden sie sich in eben solche einzelne Gattungen und Ordnungen differencirt haben, wie solches in der Pflanzen- und Thierwelt veranschaulicht wird. Die einzelnen menschlichen Individuen haben sich aber stets durch gegenseitige Reflexwirkung zu neuen Geweben, Organen und Einheiten verbunden und auf diesem Wege, unabhängig von ihrer Abstammung, zu höheren Entwicklungsstufen differencirt und erhoben. So differencirt sich die jetzt lebende Menschheit nach den Sprachen, die mit der Abstammung nur in ganz entferntem Connex stehen und als ein reines Product des socialen Lebens aufgefasst werden müssen. Nur in den niederen Racen treten noch die physischen Merkmale, wie Hautfarbe, Haarwuchs etc. als differencirender Factor hervor. Aber auch im socialen Leben sind die Individuen, Völkerschaften und Racen nur Schritt vor Schritt, im Verlaufe tausendjähriger vorhistorischer und geschichtlicher Perioden, unter beständigen Kämpfen um's Dasein, unter Anpassung an das äussere, physische und das innere, sociale Medium, durch Selection und Vererbung, vorgeschritten. Diesen ganzen Process, der auf dem allgemeinen Weltgesetz der Uebereinstimmung des Nach-, Neben- und Uebereinander alles Werden in Zeit, Raum und Potenz fusst, habe ich graphisch in meiner in französischer Sprache erschienenen Studie : *La methode graphique en Sociologie**) darzustellen versucht.

Schliesslich sei nur wiederum hervorgehoben, dass alle socialen Processe, welche Höhe sie auch erreichen mögen, nicht blos psychische, sondern gleichzeitig auch physische sind und dass der Mensch in keinem höheren Stadium seiner Entwicklung die niederen, also seine Abstammung von der anorganischen und organischen Natur, ganz verläugnen kann. Auf dieser unlösbaren Verknüpfung des höheren mit dem niederen im individuellen und socialen Leben beruht gerade die Begründung der socialen Gesetzmässigkeit in Uebereinstimmung mit den Gesetzen der Organismenwelt. Die Sociologie ist in ihren Forschungen ebenso auf die positive Psychologie und die Biologie angewiesen, wie letztere auf die Physiologie und die Chemie. Der Sociolog, der die Biologie verläugnet, wird stets nur Luftschlösser bauen statt feste Gesetze zu ergründen. —

Es giebt aber Sociologen, die den Zusammenhang zwischen Sociologie und Biologie nicht verläugnen, die im Gegentheil auf diesen Zusammenhang ihre sociologischen Anschauungen begründen, die aber in dieser Richtung auf halbem Wege stehen bleiben. Zu diesen Sociologen gehört auch Spencer mit seinem ganzen Anhang. Spencer fasst die Gesellschaft nicht als ein concretes Individuum, sondern als eine discrete Collectivität gleich den Bäumen eines Waldes, den Halmen eines Feldes, den zufällig zusammengelaufenen Thieren einer Heerde auf. Durch diese Halbheit in der Auffassung des socialen Lebens ist daher Spencer auch zu ganz einseitigen Folgerungen und Schlüssen in der Beurtheilung der socialen Erscheinungen gelangt. Er hat die vereinheitlichenden Factoren des socialen Lebens fast ganz übersehen und nur die Autonomie des

*) In den Bänden III und IV der *Annales de l'Institut international de Sociologie*.

Individuums berücksichtigt. In seinen letzten Werken, wie z. B. über die „Gerechtigkeit“ hat er den festen biologischen Boden sogar ganz verlassen und sich der aprioristischen Methode auf sociologischem Gebiete bedient. —

Einige Sociologen treten als Gegner der organischen Methode nur in Folge von Missverständnissen in der Auffassung dieser Methode, der Grenzen und der Zwecke ihrer Anwendung auf. Vor Kurzem ist eine Schrift des Herrn Professors Ludwig Stein erschienen, die einer Kritik der organischen Methode in der Sociologie gewidmet ist*). Mit den Ausführungen dieses hervorragenden Denkers stimmen wir, dem Wesen nach, meistentheils überein. Er spricht unter Anderem sich dahin aus, dass das sociale Leben in seinem ganzen Umfange nicht mechanisch erklärt werden kann (S. 15). Solches muss um so mehr als vollständig richtig anerkannt werden, als auch sogar die meisten biologischen und physiologischen Erscheinungen nicht auf die Wirkung rein mechanischer Factoren zurückgeführt werden können. Aber man vergesse dabei nicht, dass eine jede höhere Erscheinungssphäre stets alle niederen nothwendig in sich schliesst. So wird auch der sociale Organismus aus mechanischen, chemischen, physiologischen, psychologischen und socialen Energieen und Elemente gebildet. Es giebt daher auch im socialen Leben mechanische Nothwendigkeiten. Der Mensch wird auch bei Erreichung der höchsten Culturstufe immer noch, wenn auch in geringerem Verhältnisse wie früher, mechanisch arbeiten müssen. Mit anderen Worten, es wird auch in aller Zukunft, welche Form die Gesellschaft auch annehmen möge, stets Klassen geben, die mechanische Arbeit werden leisten müssen, trotz aller noch denkbaren Vervollkommnungen des Maschinenwesens. Alle Raumverhältnisse, in denen sich der Mensch bewegt, werden immer für alle Zukunft nur auf mechanischem Wege überwunden werden können. Von chemischen und physiologischen Nothwendigkeiten wird der Mensch schon deshalb stets abhängig sein, weil er sich nie seines physischen Organismus und der unlösbar mit ihm verbundenen materiellen Bedürfnisse wird entäussern können. Alle diese Nothwendigkeiten trägt das Individuum in das sociale Leben hinein und wird stets gezwungen sein sich denselben anzupassen. Es giebt aber auch rein sociale Nothwendigkeiten, die darauf beruhen, dass die Gesellschaft selbst eine Individualität, ein realer Organismus ist und sich daher nicht anders entwickeln kann, als nach allgemein gültigen biologischen Gesetzen, die auch auf biologischen Nothwendigkeiten beruhen. Wie ein jeder Naturorganismus sich physiologisch, morphologisch und einheitlich bethätigen muss, so auch jeder gesellschaftliche Verband ökonomisch, juridisch und hierarchisch-politisch. Die Theilung der Arbeit, die Concurrenz, das Verhältniss zwischen Nachfrage und Angebot, das Bevölkerungsgesetz von Malthus, das Gesetz der Bodenrente von Ricardo, das von uns festgestellte embryologische Gesetz, beruhen alle auf biologischen Nothwendigkeiten. Kein Individuum, keine Gesellschaft kann sich ihnen entziehen. Ganz ebenso beruht die psychophysische Reflexwirkung zwischen den Individuen, den socialen Geweben und Organen, die Auslösung und Aufspeicherung der Nervenenergieen im socialen Nervensystem, die Projection der individuellen und socialen psychophysischen Energieen in dem umgebenden physischen Medium, die Capitalisirung der Werthgegenstände gleichfalls auf nothwendigen psychologischen Gesetzen, die ihrerseits auf die Wechselwirkung der Zellen im individuellen Nervensystem zurückgeführt werden können. Endlich unterliegt das sociale Leben dem allgemeinen Gesetz der Uebereinstimmung des Nach-, Neben- und Uebereinander alles Werdens in Zeit, Raum und Potenz. Daher birgt in ihrem Schoosse auch eine jede Gesellschaft, sogar auf der Höhe der Cultur, alle niederen Elemente und Energieen in sich, die im Nacheinander der Geschichte sich entwickelt haben und noch heute im Nebeneinander der auf niederen Entwicklungsstufen stehenden Verbände existiren.

Hr. L. Stein stellt dem Princip der Nothwendigkeit das der Zweckmässigkeit, das im

*) Ludwig Stein : Wesen und Aufgabe der Sociologie.

socialen Leben sich als überwiegend zeigt, das Sollen dem Müssen gegenüber. Wir haben nie das überwiegende Walten des Principis der Zweckmässigkeit in der Gesellschaft geläugnet. Wir haben aber beide Principien stets als Abspiegelungen von Realitäten dargestellt, in denen keine sich absolut einseitig ausprägt, sondern stets beide gleichzeitig nur in verschiedenen Verhältnissen sich vereinigen und darstellen. Durch die Verknüpfung dieser Principien in ungleichen Verhältnissen wird der Aufbau der unendlichen Stufenleiter vom Einfachen zum Mannichfaltigen, vom Anorganischen zum Pflanzen-, Thier-, Menschen- und Gesellschaftsleben bedingt. Diese Stufenleiter haben wir sogar durch eine mathematische Formel auszudrücken versucht, deren erstes Glied aus einem unendlich grossen materiellen Zähler neben einem unendlich kleinen geistigen Nenner besteht und das letzte, uns noch unbekannte Glied aus einem unendlich kleinen materiellen Zähler nebst einem unendlich grossen geistigen Nenner bestehen muss. Die Mittelglieder dieser Formel gehen allmählig in einander über durch Verringerung des Zählers und Potencirung des Nenners*). Das sociale Leben des Menschen nimmt nun auf dieser Leiter verschiedene, je nach der Höhe der bereits erreichten Entwicklung, Culturstufen ein ohne die absolut höchste Stufe, auf welcher der Zähler als Maass der Nothwendigkeit zu Null zusammenschrumpft, erreichen zu können. Diese Stufe gehört dem absolut freien Wesen, der Gottheit, an.

Nun ist aber die Wissenschaft speciell dazu berufen, den nothwendigen Kausalzusammenhang der Erscheinungen, also das Müssen zu ergründen. Jegliches Sollen hängt dagegen vom Können ab. Der Zweckmässigkeitsbegriff gehört daher zum Gebiete der Kunst im umfassendsten Sinne dieses Wortes. Indem die Wissenschaft die nothwendigen Gesetze des Werdens ergründet, liefert sie die Möglichkeit, bestimmte Zwecke zu erreichen, erleichtert sie das Können. Darin besteht auch die Aufgabe der Sociologie, als Wissenschaft, dem socialen Sollen und Können gegenüber. Die Socialkunstlehre geht von dem Principe der Zweckmässigkeit aus, ebenso wie die angewandten technischen Wissenschaften wirthschaftliche Zwecke verfolgen, d. h. das industrielle Können zu ihrem Gegenstande haben. Aber so wie letztere sich auf die Ergebnisse der Naturkunde stützen, muss die Socialkunstlehre ihrerseits auf den Erforschungen der Sociologie fussen. Ein Zusammenwerfen der Gebiete der Wissenschaft und Kunst hat auf sociologischem Gebiete bis jetzt nur Verwirrung verursacht und zu endlosen Wortstreitigkeiten Veranlassung gegeben.

Die Zehn Gebote und die Bergpredigt enthalten ein Sollen für jeden Christen. Aber wie kann dieses Sollen im Staatsleben verwirklicht werden? Dazu müssen die Nothwendigkeiten erkannt werden, durch die jegliches Staatsleben bedingt wird. Erst nach Ergründung und Würdigung dieser Nothwendigkeiten wird der Staatsmann sich veranlasst sehen und auch im Stande sein das christliche Sollen zu realisiren.

Hr. L. Stein giebt seinerseits zu, dass nur Naturgesetze als allgemein giltige, nothwendige Gesetze angesehen werden müssen (S. 15). Er zweifelt nur daran, dass es der Sociologie je gelingen könnte solche Gesetze zu ergründen. Die Aufzählung der obenangeführten bereits festgestellten socialen Nothwendigkeiten könnte einen solchen Zweifel heben. Aber der Hr. Verfasser stellt der natürlichen Gesetzmässigkeit noch eine Ereignissgesetzmässigkeit gegenüber, die auf statistische Zahlen, auf bestimmte Periodicitäten des socialen Geschehens, auf regelmässig sich wiederholende Rhythmen in der socialen Entwicklung, sich gründet. Der auf das Wirken einzelner Persönlichkeiten, auf bestimmte Reihenfolge von Begebenheiten und Zustände zurückzuführende Kausalzusammenhang bildet aber den Gegenstand der Geschichte und speciell der Cultur- und der Philosophie der Geschichte. Würde die Sociologie denselben Kausalzusammenhang erforschen, so würde ihr Gebiet mit diesen Disciplinen zusammenfallen und Hr. Paul Barth wäre vollständig im Recht, indem er in seiner

*) Gedanken über die Socialwissenschaft der Zukunft, Bd. II, S. 48.

„Philosophie der Geschichte als Sociologie“ die Sociologie und Geschichtsphilosophie gleichsetzt. Die Existenzberechtigung der Sociologie als selbstständige Wissenschaft gründet sich gerade darauf, dass sie die Erforschung der nothwendigen Gesetze des socialen Geschehens zum Gegenstand hat. Dieses kann aber nur durch Anwendung der organischen Methode erreicht werden. Die Sociologie, als selbstständige Wissenschaft, steht und fällt mit dieser Methode, da sie die einzige ist, die als Postulat die Anerkennung der menschlichen Gesellschaft als lebendes Wesen, als Individuum, als einen realen Organismus setzt. —

Die Grenzen, welche die Sociologie einzuhalten hat, werden ihr von der Biologie vorgeschrieben. Die Biologie ist auch ihrerseits gezwungen sich auf die Erforschung allgemeiner Gesetze zu beschränken. Auf die Erklärung des Kausalzusammenhanges zwischen einzelnen Ereignissen und Geschehnissen muss sie verzichten. Nehmen wir den Fall an, dass auf irgend einem Gipfel des Corsicanischen Gebirges ein Adler von ungewöhnlicher Grösse mit einem mächtigen Schnabel und ungeheuren Krallen geboren wäre. Kein Biologe würde im Stande sein, wegen der Mannichfaltigkeit der Factoren, die dabei mitgewirkt hätten, ein solches Ereigniss zu erklären. Nimmt dieser Adler seinen Flug nach Frankreich, dann nach Aegypten, Italien, Deutschland und Russland und richtet ungeheure Verwüstungen unter der Geflügelwelt an, so würde auch dieses von einem Biologen auf Grundlage der von ihm erforschten allgemeinen Gesetze nicht erklärt werden können. Ebenso wenig wird ein Sociologe eine Erklärung liefern können, woher Napoleon gerade auf der Insel Corsica geboren worden ist, woher er seinen Adlerflug vorzugsweise nach einer Richtung hin und nicht nach einer anderen gewählt hat u. s. w. Und das hat seine Giltigkeit in Hinsicht auf die Erscheinung aller ungewöhnlichen Persönlichkeiten und auf diejenigen Begebenheiten, wo der Zufall als Hauptfactor eintritt. Der Zufall hat aber in der Geschichte eine oft ausschlaggebende Rolle gespielt. Die Beschreibung des Lebenslaufes solcher Persönlichkeiten und solcher Begebenheiten liegt der Geschichte als erzählenden Wissenschaft ob, die daher auch mit Recht theilweise als eine Kunst angesehen wird. Auch ein jedes zufällige Ereigniss wird durch bestimmte Ursachen hervorgerufen, so wie auch der Wille eines jeden Individuums durch äussere Einflüsse und innere Motive determinirt. Die Mannichfaltigkeit und Complicirtheit der dabei wirkenden Factoren ist aber eine so grosse, dass sie nur ausnahmsweise und in sehr beschränktem Maasse wissenschaftlich erforscht und begründet werden können. In Hinsicht auf das sociale Geschehen ist es die pragmatische Geschichtschreibung, die diese Aufgabe zu lösen hat. Das Zusammenfassen der Begebenheiten und Zustände unter allgemeinere Gesichtspunkte gehört der Culturgeschichte und der Geschichtsphilosophie an. Die Sociologie ist dagegen auf das einzige noch freie Gebiet der Ergründung der nothwendigen Naturgesetze im socialen Geschehen angewiesen. Ueberschreitet sie die Grenzen dieses Gebiets, so erweitert sie sich zur Universal-socialwissenschaft, mit der Tendenz, alle übrigen socialen Disciplinen in sich aufzunehmen: Oekonomie, Jurisprudenz, Politik, Sprachkunde, Religion, Ethik, Aesthetik, Anthropologie, Ethnographie, Geschichte etc. Statt etwas positives zu leisten, wird die Sociologie durch eine solche Erweiterung nur zum gemeinschaftlichen Tummelplatz für zufällige und ordnungslose Ausflüge aus den benachbarten Gebieten. Daher geschieht es auch, dass Oekonomisten, Rechtsgelehrte, Anthropologen, Ethnographen und Geschichtschreiber ihre speciellen Forschungen als sociologische bezeichnen, indem sie sich darauf beschränken ihren Darstellungen einfach die Ausdrücke: Evolution, socialen Progress, Regress, Process etc. hinzuzufügen. Dabei sind sie aber zugleich ausgesprochene Gegner der organischen Methode in der Sociologie, weil ihnen gerade dasjenige Gebiet, welches als Grundlage für die Sociologie dienen muss, nämlich die Biologie, fast vollständig unbekannt und ihre ganze Auffassungsweise des socialen Geschehens keine naturwissenschaftliche, sondern entweder eine pragmatische oder eine aprioristische ist. —

Was den jetzt auf dem Gebiete der Sociologie herrschenden Wirrwarr noch steigert, das ist die von Auguste Comte eingeführte, von Spencer und seiner Schule adoptirte und von den meisten amerikanischen Sociologen weiter durchgeführte Eintheilung der Sociologie in Statik und Dynamik.

Es kann eine Statik nur in der Physik geben, weil nur die mechanischen Kräfte in's Gleichgewicht gerathen und in diesem Zustande erforscht werden können. Die Organismenwelt stellt ein beständiges Umwandeln und Umformen der Kräfte und Gestaltungen dar. Als Gleichgewichtszustände können in Hinsicht auf die Lebewesen nur diejenigen Momente angesehen werden, durch welche die Uebergänge aus einem Zustande in den anderen bezeichnet werden. Das sind aber immer nur Zustände, die dem Forscherauge entchlüpfen wie die einzelnen Tropfen eines dahinfließenden Stromes. Für den Biologen und um so mehr für den Sociologen kann es daher nur eine Dynamik geben. Diejenigen Erscheinungen, welche jene Sociologen unter der Rubrik Statik verzeichnen, nämlich die bestehenden Institutionen, Rechtsverhältnisse etc. bestimmen den inneren und äusseren Bau einer Gesellschaft, gehören daher in die Sphäre der socialen Morphologie. Letztere ist aber auch ihrem Wesen nach eine Dynamik, weil die Formen und Verhältnisse sich unaufhaltsam verändern. Sie befinden sich gleich den übrigen Lebensfactors in einem beständigen Fluss. Die Biologie kennt daher auch nur eine Morphologie und keine Statik. Dieser Begriff ist, mit Umgehung der Biologie, direct aus der Mechanik auf die Sociologie fälschlicherweise übertragen worden und hat daher auf sociologischem Gebiete eine unheilsame Verwirrung angestiftet.

Bevor wir weiter gehen, suchen wir nur noch einen Blick auf das Verhältniss zu werfen, in welches die Sociologie bei Anwendung der organischen Methode zu der Culturgeschichte treten wird. Die Philosophie der Geschichte ist ihrem Wesen nach nur eine philosophisch behandelte Culturgeschichte, daher auch Alles, was wir von jenem Verhältniss sagen werden, auch auf die Geschichtsphilosophie bezogen werden kann. —

Die positive Sociologie wird sich zuvörderst zur Aufgabe stellen müssen, für die Culturgeschichte denjenigen Rahmen herzustellen, in welchem das sociale Geschehen in allen Sphären : der ökonomischen, juridischen, politischen, so wie der religiösen, ethischen und ästhetischen nothwendig vor sich gehen muss, den Rahmen, welchen das sociale Leben unter keinen Bedingungen und Verhältnissen überschreiten kann, und welcher alle geschichtlichen Begebenheiten und Ereignisse als einzelne Momente einer und derselben Evolution von Energieen umfasst.

Wie dieser Rahmen sich gestalten soll, wird von den durch die Sociologie bereits festgestellten und noch festzustellenden nothwendigen Gesetzen des socialen Geschehens bestimmt werden. Zuvörderst werden aber die Errungenschaften der Sociologie nicht ermangeln in Hinsicht auf Zeit- und Raumbestimmungen dieselbe Bedeutung für die Culturgeschichte zu gewinnen, welche die Geologie und die Entwicklungslehre für die Naturgeschichte bereits erhalten haben.

Da die Psyche des Menschen ein Product des socialen Lebens ist, so müssen die in seiner Person und speciell in seinen geistigen Organen capitalisirten psychophysischen Energieen als Maassstab für die von ihm erreichte individuelle und sociale Entwicklungsstufe dienen. Diese Capitalisation persönlicher Energieen im socialen Medium implicirte, besonders in vorhistorischer Zeit, eine fast ebenso langwierige, durch unzählige Anomalien aufgehaltene und oft in rückschreitende Bewegung versetzte Evolution von Kräften, wie solches in Hinsicht auf die Entwicklung, Differencirung und Individualirung der Organismen im Pflanzen- und Thierreich inmitten des physischen Mediums vor sich gegangen war. Berücksichtigt man nun die geschichtlichen Epochen, so findet man, dass in ihrem Verlaufe die psychischen Anlagen des

Menschen sich nur um eine geringe Stufe erhöht haben. Trotz des Evangeliums Christi haben wir in Hinsicht auf Personenwerth wenig vor den alten Römern und Griechen voraus, und haben sogar viele ihre guten Eigenschaften eingebüsst. Die moderne Cultur ist mehr eine äusserliche als innerliche, sie ist mehr auf Werthsachen als auf Personenwerthe gerichtet. Daher ist die moderne Cultur eine einseitige, ja in gewissem Sinne eine verkehrte : sie stellt das Object höher als das Subject, die Sache höher als die Person. Die Folge davon ist ein Stillstand in der Entwicklung des Culturmenschen, und dieser Stillstand kann leicht in eine Rückbildung ausarten, wenn nicht bald den jetzt obwaltenden Anomalien abgeholfen wird. —

Betrachtet man nun die menschliche Cultur von dem Standpunkte der Capitalisation höherer persönlicher Energiepotenciale aus, so schrumpfen die einzelnen welterschütternden Begebenheiten, ja ganze historische Perioden zu momentan vorübergehenden Episoden in der Entwicklung der Menschheit und des Menschen zusammen. Die Menschheit wird aller Wahrscheinlichkeit nach wohl noch Millionen von Jahren existiren. Sie wird noch tausende von historischen Epochencyklen durchleben, es werden noch tausende welterschütternde Ereignisse auf einander folgen, die Culturcentren werden sich unzählige Male von einem Punkte unseres Planeten auf andere verschieben. Die pragmatische Geschichte wird alle diese Wandlungen erzählen, aber der künftige Culturhistoriker wird ihnen den ihm von der Sociologie gebotenen Maassstab des persönlichen Werthes des Individuums und der Gesammtheiten anlegen und nach demselben den erreichten Fortschritt bemessen.

Die Astronomen und Naturforscher des Alterthums sind ausser Stande gewesen das Werden in der anorganischen und organischen Natur zu erklären, weil sie zu geringe Zeit- und Raumcoefficienten in Rechnung brachten. Erst seit Erfindung des Teleskops und Mikroskops, seit den neueren Entdeckungen der Geologie und der Begründung der Entwicklungslehre hat sich der Horizont der Naturkunde in dem Maasse erweitert, dass eine positive Naturphilosophie auf derselben begründet werden kann. Nun haben auch die Culturhistoriker stets den Fehler begangen, dass sie die Geschichte der Menschheit mit zu kleinen Zeitcoefficienten maassen, daher sie auch einzelnen Perioden, Culturcentren, Begebenheiten und Persönlichkeiten eine verhältnissmässig zu grosse Bedeutung zuerkannten. Auch hat die Culturgeschichte bis jetzt ihre Aufmerksamkeit mehr Denkmälern, Kunstproducten etc. als dem Menschen selbst zugewandt. Sie hat mehr die Zwischenzellensubstanz als die lebendigen Elemente der socialen Gesammtheiten berücksichtigt. In Folge dessen entging ihnen auch das einzige Maass, das als Norm für die Bestimmung des geschichtlichen Werdens in fort- oder rückschreitender Bewegung dienen müsste, nämlich der Mensch selbst als Product des socialen Lebens. Durch die Feststellung des socialembryologischen Entwicklungsgesetzes ist nun dieses Maass für die Culturgeschichte gewonnen. Zugleich wird auch der Horizont der Culturgeschichte durch Anknüpfung der Sociologie an die Biologie ebenso erweitert wie auch letztere durch die Entwicklungslehre an Breite und Tiefe gewonnen hat. —

Alles eben Gesagte bezieht sich auf die allgemeine Culturgeschichte, die sich der Geschichtsphilosophie anknüpft. Die speciellen Zweige der Culturgeschichte dagegen, die einzelne Länder und Epochen zum Gegenstand haben, nähern sich ihrem erzählenden Charakter nach mehr der pragmatischen Geschichtschreibung. Diese erforscht den Kausalzusammenhang der Ereignisse und classificirt die Epochen nach anderen Kategorieen, als die Sociologie, weil ihre Ausgangspunkte und die Zwecke, die eine jede dieser Disciplinen verfolgt, verschieden sind.

Ueber die philosophische Bedeutung der socialorganischen Theorie sind verschiedene, ja entgegengesetzte Urtheile verlautbart worden. Die Anhänger des historischen Materialismus halten die Organiker für Idealisten ; die Anhänger der idealistischen Weltanschauung sehen sie dagegen als potencirte Materialisten an, indem sie von der Ueberzeugung ausgehen, dass durch

die realorganische Auffassung der Gesellschaft das ideale Princip aus seinem letzten Zufluchtsort auf Erden, dem socialen Leben, in das bodenlose und wesenlose Gebiet der Materie hinausgestossen wird. —

Sehen wir nun, inwiefern die realorganische Auffassung der Gesellschaft mit einer jeden dieser beiden Weltanschauungen, der materialistischen, sowie der idealistischen, übereinstimmt und nach welchen Richtungen hin sie mit denselben sich in Widerspruch befindet. —

Die Materialisten fassen ihre Lehre auf der unlösbaren Zusammengehörigkeit von Geist und Stoff im menschlichen Individuum : keine geistige Regung ohne entsprechenden Stoffumsatz in den Nervenorganen, kein Fühlen, Denken und Wollen ohne entsprechende Auslösung von mechanischen, chemischen, physiologischen Energieen. Dem Wesen nach stimmen die Idealisten damit überein, indem sie zugeben müssen, dass zum Denken ein Gehirn und zum Fühlen und Wollen ein Nervensystem nothwendig sind. Nichtsdestoweniger erheben die Idealisten stets Einwendungen, sobald die Wissenschaft etwas Näheres über die materiellen Processe statuirt, die mit dem Denken, Fühlen und Wollen im menschlichen Körper und speciell in seinem Nervensystem gleichzeitig vor sich gehen.

Die Materialisten vergessen aber ihrerseits nur zu oft, dass der Geist seinem Wesen nach eine Kraft ist und dass zwischen Kraft und Stoff, obgleich die eine ohne den anderen nicht denkbar ist, dennoch ein Gegensatz obwaltet, ja, dass sie sich in gewisser Hinsicht gegenseitig negiren. Eine Kraft ohne Stoff können wir weder sehen noch antasten, freilich auch den Stoff ohne Kraft nicht ; aber die Kraft ist dennoch das ideale Princip, das sich uns im Stoff kund thut ; daher auch die Idealisten mit Recht darauf bestehen, dass der Geist eine Kraft ist. Aber dann erweisen sie sich wiederum in ihren weiteren Ausführungen als vollständig inconsequent. Indem sie zugeben, dass der Geist eine Kraft ist, fügen sie ihrem Zugeständniss die Klausel hinzu, dass der Geist seinem Wesen nach etwas absolut Verschiedenes ist von den Kräften, die sich in der Natur kund thun. Nun läge es ihnen demnach ob, den Beweis zu liefern oder wenigstens anzudeuten, in welchem Moment und unter welchen Verhältnissen diese absolut neue Kraft sich dem menschlichen Körper zugesellt. Diesen Beweis sind sie aber bis jetzt noch schuldig geblieben, wogegen die Naturkunde die allmähliche Potencirung der mechanischen, chemischen und physiologischen Energieen Schritt vor Schritt in der Organismenwelt und im Menschen erforscht hat und kein Moment hat wahrnehmen können, das als Abgrenzungszeichen zwischen diesen und den psychischen Energieen anerkannt werden könnte.

Was thun nun die Organiker ? Sie suchen den Beweis zu liefern, dass im socialen Leben das Verhältniss zwischen Kraft und Stoff dasselbe ist, wie zwischen Geist und Materie in unserem Körper, dass aber im socialen Organismus die geistige Kraft sich noch höher als im Individuum potencirt, indem sie sich als sociale psychische Energieen kund thut. Dementsprechend bildet und gestaltet sich auch der Stoff im socialen Körper auf mannichfachere Weise und in freieren Formen als im individuellen Organismus. Da nun auf jeder höheren Stufe des Werdens in der Erscheinungswelt, beim Zusammengehen von Kraft und Stoff das psychische Princip immer mehr die Oberhand über das physische gewinnt, so leisten die Organiker der idealen Weltanschauung einen wesentlichen leider bis jetzt noch nicht anerkannten Dienst, indem sie den Beweis liefern, dass im socialen Organismus die Kraft im Verhältniss zum Stoff noch höhere geistige Potenzen erreicht, als solches im Individuum der Fall ist. In dem fünften Bande unserer „Gedanken über die Socialwissenschaft der Zukunft : Versuch einer natürlichen Theologie“, haben wir bewiesen, dass auch die christliche Theologie die Kirche als einen erweiterten Leib Christi, also als einen realen Organismus auffasst, und dass das Verhältniss zwischen der sichtbaren und unsichtbaren Kirche seitens der christlichen Dogmenlehre ebenso gedeutet wird, wie das Verhältniss zwischen Leib und Seele im Menschen. Bis jetzt fehlte das Zwischengebiet, welches den Begriff des Individuums mit dem der Kirche substantiell verknüpfen könnte. Dieses Gebiet ist gerade von den Organikern entdeckt und erforscht worden. Auf dem von ihnen bearbeitenden Gebiete begegnen sich und reichen sich die Hände die christliche Kirchenlehre mit

der Auffassung der Solidarität der Individuen im socialen Leben. Die organische Sociologie bietet demgemäss den Vereinigungspunkt zwischen Idealismus und Materialismus, zwischen Kirchenlehre und Organismenlehre.

Man wird möglicher Weise bei dieser Gelegenheit wiederum die ewig alten und immer neuen Fragen aufwerfen wollen : In welchem Theile des Körpers befindet sich die Seele bei Lebzeiten des Menschen und wo bleibt sie nach der Auflösung des Körpers ? — Der Sociologe ist, als wissenschaftlicher Forscher, nicht verpflichtet auf diese Fragen eine Antwort zu liefern. Da aber die organische Sociologie neben und über dem individuellen Bewusstsein noch ein collectives, das sociale Bewusstsein, statuirt, so wollen wir diese Fragen vom sociologischen Standpunkte aus unter Anwendung der organischen Methode beleuchten.

Das sociale Bewusstsein, das aus dem Zusammenfühlen, -denken und -wollen der die Gemeinschaft bildenden Personen hervorgeht und die Einheitlichkeit des gesellschaftlichen und Staatslebens bedingt, ist ein Collectivbewusstsein. Dieses Bewusstsein ist stets im ganzen socialen Organismus und in jedem seiner Theile vorhanden. Aber nicht alle Theile sind im Stande dieselbe Höhe des Bewusstseins zu erreichen und von demselben sich leiten zu lassen. Die meisten Zellelemente der Gesellschaft verhalten sich in Hinblick auf das Ganze instinktiv oder halbbewusst. Sogar in den höheren Culturstaaten ist es immer nur eine verschwindend kleine Minderheit, die sich der Vereinheitlichung des Gesamtlebens vollständig bewusst ist. Im normalen Zustande müsste eigentlich die Regierung, als Centralorgan des socialen Nervensystems, diese Minderheit in sich schliessen. Das ist jedoch nicht immer der Fall, weil das Gesellschaftsleben unzähligen Anomalien ausgesetzt ist. Zu den Regierungsorganen gewinnen oft nicht bloss einseitig entwickelte, sondern auch geradezu blödsinnige Elemente Zutritt. Dann findet das höhere Einheitsbewusstsein in anderen Theilen und Kreisen der Gesellschaft Zuflucht : bei den Philosophen, Gelehrten, Künstlern, in der Kirche, der Armee etc. Ein solches Wandern der höheren Bewusstseins Elemente wird im socialen Organismus deshalb ermöglicht, weil die das sociale Nervensystem bildenden Elemente, die Personen, nicht mechanisch an einander geknüpft sind, sondern selbst meistens Wanderzellen sind und auf die mannichfachste Weise gegen die sie erreichenden socialen Reize reagiren können.

Der menschliche Körper stellt auch eine Collectivität von Einzelzellen dar. Daher ist das individuelle Bewusstsein stets auch ein Collectivbewusstsein und richtig der Ausspruch : die Seele ist ganz im ganzen Körper und ganz in jedem seiner Theile. Aber wie im socialen, so reagiren auch im individuellen Organismus nicht alle Theile gleichmässig gegen die vereinheitlichenden Reize. Die Reizwirkung und die Reaction auf die Reize erfolgt in höherem Grade im Nervensystem und in höchster Potenz im menschlichen Gehirn. Da nun aber die das individuelle Nervensystem bildenden Elemente nicht aus Wanderzellen bestehen, sondern feste Theile der einzelnen Nervengewebe und -organe bilden, so zeichnet sich das individuelle Bewusstsein, dem socialen gegenüber, durch mehr Stetigkeit und Continuität aus. Bei anormalen Zuständen, wie z. B. bei hysterischen, hypnotischen etc., erhält jedoch auch das individuelle Bewusstsein den Charakter eines wandernden Bewusstseins ; es kann sich in zwei oder mehrere Bewusstseinscentren spalten, wie solches z. B. beim Dedubliren des Selbstbewusstseins bei hysterischen Personen der Fall ist. Der Vergleich des individuellen Bewusstseins mit dem socialen wirft also ein helles Licht auf den Entwicklungsprocess beider. Was jedoch die Seele an und für sich ist, kann ein Sociolog ebenso wenig erklären, wie ein Naturforscher das Wesen der Kraft und ein Philosoph das Wesen des Gedankens, des Gefühls und des Willens.

Wo bleibt das sociale Bewusstsein nach Auflösung des gesellschaftlichen Verbandes, wo bleibt die Seele des Individuums nach Zerstörung des Körpers ? Diese Fragen wären gleichbedeutend mit der an den Naturforscher zu stellenden Frage : was geschieht mit den in den Weltenraum sich zerstreuen Licht- und Wärmeenergieen ? Die von uns aufgestellte Hypothese eines in Analogie des Lichtäthers das Weltall erfüllenden geistigen Aethers ist als ein

Versuch zur Lösung jener Fragen anzusehen. Wir verweisen daher den geneigten Leser auf das zehnte Capitel unseres „Versuches einer natürlichen Theologie“, welches über die Unsterblichkeitslehre handelt*).

In welchem Verhältnisse steht nun die Lehre der Organiker zu der neu aufgetauchten Lehre des geschichtlichen Materialismus ?

Beschränkt sich letztere darauf den Beweis zu liefern, dass die Gesellschaft, wie auch das Individuum, gezwungen ist zuvörderst den dringendsten physischen Bedürfnissen Befriedigung zu verschaffen und dass erst später die psychischen Energieen wirksam sein können, so muss man gestehen, dass die Anhänger dieser Lehre sich damit beschäftigen Eulen nach Athen zu tragen, indem sie eine allgemein anerkannte Wahrheit als eine neue Entdeckung anerkannt wissen wollen. Dasselbe gilt auch von der Thesis, dass der Mensch und die Gesellschaft in ihrer materiellen Existenz und in ihrem Entwicklungsgange von dem sie umgebenden physischen Medium, der Atmosphäre, der Bodenbeschaffenheit, dem Klima etc. bedingt werden. Schon in Hinsicht auf die Pflanzen- und Thiergattungen ist jedoch die Wissenschaft bereits nicht im Stande alle Factoren zu erforschen, die zur Bildung derselben mitgewirkt haben, um so schwieriger ist es in Hinsicht der verschiedenen Menschenracen und Gesammtheiten. Der bereits als falsch anerkannte materialistische Satz : der Mensch ist was er isst, würde in seiner Anpassung an das sociale Leben lauten: die Gesellschaft ist, was sie isst, oder im Verlaufe der Geschichte gegessen hat. Die Anhänger des geschichtlichen Materialismus haben selbst ihre Lehre freilich nicht zu einem so scharf lautenden Satz zugespitzt; erwägt man jedoch, dass sie die ganze Entwicklungsgeschichte der Menschheit als das Resultat der Wirkung ökonomischer Factoren ansehen, die doch vorzugsweise nur die Befriedigung der physischen Bedürfnisse des Menschen bezwecken, so ist man berechtigt sie denjenigen Forschern gleichzustellen, die alle Gedanken, Gefühle und Willensacte des Menschen auf die Assimilation bestimmter Nährstoffe zurückführen wollen.

Die Welt wird nicht bloß durch den Hunger, dessen Ausfluss der Egoismus ist, regiert, sondern auch durch die Liebe. Im gesellschaftlichen Verbande erweitert sich die Liebe zur Sympathie. Die Sympathie aber ist ein Product der socialen Reflexwirkung. Die Anhänger des geschichtlichen Materialismus berücksichtigen nicht, dass der Mensch als solcher und speciell der Culturmensch vorzugsweise ein Product des socialen sympathischen Lebensprocesses ist und dass das psychologische Capital, über welches er verfügt, das Resultat unzähliger Reflexwirkungen ist, die in der Urgesellschaft möglicher Weise in engerem Zusammenhange mit den ökonomischen Verhältnissen standen, die aber später unabhängig von denselben vor sich gegangen sind. Die nordamerikanischen Indianer führten ein Jägerleben und dieser Theil Amerikas kannte keine anderen ökonomischen Verhältnisse bis die ersten europäischen Ansiedler erschienen. Diese brachten ein durch Abstammung von einer höheren Race ererbtes und durch Erziehung in einem höheren socialen Medium ausgebildetes grossartiges Capital von persönlichen psychophysischen Energieen mit sich und gestalteten inmitten desselben physischen Mediums die ökonomischen Verhältnisse des Landes vollständig um. Die Anhäufung dieses persönlichen Capitals ist aber während unmessbarer vorhistorischer und historischer Epochen vor sich gegangen, ist das Resultat mannichfachster Anpassungen an die verschiedenartigsten klimatischen und tellurischen Lebensbedingungen, in welchen die Vorfahren der Ansiedler auf ihren früheren Wanderschaften sich befunden haben, das Resultat des Kampfes um's Dasein ganzer Völkerschaften und Racen, der Selection unzähliger auf einander folgender Generationen. Zur Aufspeicherung dieses Capitals haben nicht bloß ökonomische, sondern noch mehr religiöse,

*) Gedanken über die Socialwissenschaft der Zukunft, Bd. V, S. 404.

ethische, intellectuelle und ästhetische Factoren durch Reflexwirkung mitgespielt. Heben wir nur einen dieser Factore, den religiösen, hervor. Der Pietismus, dem die ersten europäischen Ansiedler in Nordamerika huldigten, stammt aus dem Christenthum, dieses aus dem Mosaismus, die Quellen des letzteren sind vielleicht in der esoterischen Lehre des religiösen Systems der alten Aegypter zu suchen. Ist es nun möglich die Genesis, die Verbreitung und die spätere Umbildung der religiösen Ideen, die den Pietismus hervorbrachten, auf ökonomische Factoren zurückzuführen ? Setzen wir nun voraus, dass Nordamerika von solchen Ansiedlern bevölkert worden wäre, welche in Folge religiöser Ueberzeugungen und Dogmen, keine Fleischnahrung, keine Baumwollenkleidung, keine Metalle gebrauchen dürften ; würden die ökonomischen Verhältnisse des Landes dann nicht ganz andere sein als die gegenwärtigen ?

Es sind also vorzugsweise Ideen und nicht ökonomische Verhältnisse, durch welche die Welt regiert wird, aber der Organiker fügt nur noch hinzu: nicht individuelle, sondern sociale Ideen. Der vereinzelte Gedanke des Individuums hat weder einen socialen, noch geschichtlichen Werth ; er erhält einen solchen nur insofern er durch Wort, Schrift, Kunstproduct anderen Menschen mitgetheilt, in's Fleisch und Blut, durch Reflexwirkung, in andere individuelle Nervensysteme hinübergetragen wird und auf diesem Wege zum Gemeingut des socialen Nervensystems einer Nationalität, einer religiösen Gemeinschaft, oder der ganzen Menschheit wird. Die zehn Gebote hätten weder einen nationalen Werth für das jüdische Volk, noch einen universellen für die Menschheit erhalten, hätte Moses die Tafeln auf dem Sinai liegen lassen ohne den Inhalt derselben dem Volke mitzuthemen. Wäre Christus in der Wüste geblieben und hätte seine Lehre nicht unter seinen Jüngern verbreitet, so wäre das Christenthum mit dem Stifter desselben erloschen. Nur das immer weitere Kreise umfassende christliche Zusammenfühlen, -denken und -wollen der Menschen hat dem Christenthum die Bedeutung einer Weltreligion verliehen.

Ebenso verhält es sich mit dem sogenannten Heroencultus, als dessen Hauptvertreter Carlyle anzusehen ist. Unzählige Heldenthaten sind in der Geschichte spurlos verklungen, unzählige, ungenannte Helden sind ruhmlos auf den Schlachtfeldern gefallen, unzählige Denker, Forscher und Künstler sind ihren Ueberanstrengungen und inneren Kämpfen erlegen. Diejenigen Persönlichkeiten, die sich zu geschichtlichen Heroen emporgeschwungen, haben es Umständen zu verdanken, die sie in's Centrum erhöhter psychophysischer Reflexwirkung der Zeitgenossen gestellt haben. Alexander von Macedonien, Peter der Grosse, Friedrich der Grosse, Napoleon erscheinen in der Geschichte als hervorragende Thätigkeits- und Culturcentren, weil sie in höherer Potenz social gelebt und gewirkt haben. Ihre Persönlichkeiten stellen solche Zellenelemente in den betreffenden socialen Nervensystemen dar, um die sich neue Gewebe und Organe gebildet haben und die dazu beigetragen haben die früheren aufzulösen und umzugestalten. Das ist aber auch hauptsächlich nur auf dem Wege der socialen Reflexwirkung geschehen. Da nun das historische Heldenthum nicht ausschliesslich auf den inneren ethischen Werth der Persönlichkeit, wie solches in Hinsicht auf den Stifter des Christenthums der Fall ist, sondern meistens auf äussere Verhältnisse und Umstände zurückzuführen ist, so ist ein Heroencultus in dem Sinne, wie ihn Carlyle versteht, ein moralisches Unding. Er ist gleichbedeutend mit der Vergötterung des nicht selten durch Zufall erreichten Erfolges, des *fait accompli*. Hervorragende Denker, Forscher und Künstler können ihrerseits schon deshalb nicht als cultuswerth gelten, weil sie immer nur specielle, meistens einseitige Potenzen psychischer Energieen repräsentiren. Nur der höhere Allmensch kann als Object des Cultus dienen, und ein solcher war Christus.

Die Sprache muss als das Ur- und Hauptmittel jeglicher socialen Reflexwirkung anerkannt werden ; Schriftzeichen, sowie Kunstproducte können nur als Hilfsmittel zu Erreichung desselben Zwecks angesehen werden. Daher könnten die Organiker der Thesis der Anhänger des historischen Materialismus, die Menschheit sei nämlich zu dem geworden, was sie gegessen hat, den Satz gegenüberstellen : die Menschheit ist zu dem geworden, was sie gesprochen hat. Das Wort ist stets der Träger der intellectuellen, religiösen, ethischen, ästhetischen, auch der

ökonomischen, rechtlichen und hierarchisch-politischen Reflexwirkung bereits in der Urgemeinschaft der Menschen gewesen ; im Verlaufe der Geschichte ist es allmählich durch Ausbildung der höheren socialen Nervenorgane im Menschen und in der Gesellschaft, durch Aufspeicherung stets höherer psychischer Energieen in den individuellen und socialen Nervensystemen, zu Fleisch geworden. Im Allmenschen Christus hat die Fleischwerdung des Wortes eine solche Höhe erreicht, dass das Wort, das ihn zu derselben erhoben hat, als Gottes Wort von der christlichen Dogmenlehre aufgefasst wird.

Indem wir solches aussprechen, wollen wir nicht Theologie treiben, sondern nur andeuten, dass die organische Methode, weit entfernt zu einer materialistischen Weltanschauung zu führen, im Gegentheil die Mittel bietet die Ergebnisse der Naturkunde mit den religiösen Strebungen und Satzungen in Einklang zu bringen.

Wir wollen schliesslich nur noch den Gegensatz hervorheben, den die ökonomisch-materialistische und die psychoorganische Auffassungen des socialen Geschehens vom Standpunkte des Fortschritts bekunden. Der ökonomische Fortschritt besteht in einer stets umfassenderen Arbeitstheilung, in einer stets intensiveren wirthschaftlichen Concurrenz ; in einer Capitalisirung stets grösserer Werthe, in einer stets complicirteren Geldwirthschaft. Das Geld, als allgemeines Tauschmittel und Preisnorm stellt eine quantitative Grösse dar und drückt der ökonomischen Sphäre in allen ihren Verrichtungen und Gestaltungen nothwendig einen vorzugsweise mechanischen Charakter auf. Der ökonomische Fortschritt führt also zum steigenden Mechanismus und dieser befördert seinerseits die egoistischen Triebe im socialen Leben. Vom Standpunkte der organischen Auffassung des socialen Geschehens besteht dagegen der Fortschritt in einem steigenden Ueberwiegen des Psychismus über den Mechanismus, der altruistischen Triebe über die egoistischen. Das durch den organischen Reflexprocess bewirkte Zusammenfühlen, -denken und -wollen entspringt der auf Sympathie begründeten Tendenz des Einzelnen seinen psychischen Energieen Ausdruck zu verleihen in der Absicht Anklang bei seinen Mitmenschen zu finden ohne gleichwerthige Gegendienste von denselben zu fordern ; der auf dem Gesetze der Nachfrage und des Angebots begründete ökonomische Tauschhandel von Werthgegenständen und -diensten hat dagegen zu seiner Devise: gieb weniger und erhalte mehr, verkauf theurer und kauf billiger. Der Reflexprocess bezweckt den Austausch und die Verbreitung von Ideen, sowie die Aufspeicherung höher potencirter psychischer Energieen in den Personen und im socialen Nervensystem ; der ökonomische Process hat dagegen zum Zweck die Besitzergreifung und den Austausch von Sachen, sowie die Ansammlung von Werthgegenständen. Zwischen Idee und Werthobject waltet derselbe Gegensatz ob, wie zwischen Kraft und Stoff, und je höher die Idee desto schärfer tritt dieser Gegensatz hervor.

Dieses möge genügen, um die idealistische Tendenz der organischen Methode zu bezeichnen. Aber der Organiker, als wissenschaftlicher Forscher, ist verpflichtet, den Process zu ergründen, durch welchen die Genesis, der Austausch, die Verbreitung und die Capitalisirung der Ideen bedingt wird und dieser Process ist kein rein psychischer, sondern ein psychophysischer in der Gesellschaft, wie auch im Individuum. Und als ein psychophysischer kann dieser Process wiederum nur dann anerkannt werden, wenn die Gesellschaft selbst als ein lebendiges Individuum, d. h. als ein realer Organismus aufgefasst wird. Wer die Realität des socialen Organismus leugnet, entzieht der Wissenschaft das Object selbst der Forschung. Dann ist die Anwendung der realvergleichenden und inductiven Methode im naturwissenschaftlichen Sinne unmöglich und der Forscher ist gezwungen sich der aprioristischen Methode zu bedienen, die bis jetzt sich als vollständig unfruchtbar auf socialwissenschaftlichen Gebiete erwiesen hat. Als ebenso resultatlos hat sich aber auch die auf den Vergleich verschiedener socialer Gestaltungen und Verrichtungen begründete Methode erwiesen, weil mit Hilfe derselben immer nur zufällige historische Ereignisse und Ergebnisse unter einander verglichen werden konnten, die unmöglich zur Entdeckung oder Feststellung irgend welcher nothwendigen Gesetze des socialen Geschehens

führen konnten. Daher gehört auch die Mehrzahl der Anhänger der historischvergleichenden Methode zu den Skeptikern, die da behaupten, dass es überhaupt keine Gesetze im naturwissenschaftlichen Sinne für das sociale Werden giebt und geben kann. Diese Behauptung, die schon logisch als unhaltbar anerkannt werden muss, ist seitens der Organiker bereits auch factisch widerlegt worden durch Feststellung einer ganzen Reihe positiver Gesetze, die dem socialen Leben gemeinsam sind mit dem Leben in der Natur. Die Leistungen der Sociologen in dieser Richtung haben bis jetzt seitens der Antiorganiker keine Würdigung erfahren, weil letzteren die naturwissenschaftliche Auffassung des socialen Geschehens vollständig fremd ist, sie auch nicht über die nothwendigen biologischen Kenntnisse verfügen, um den tieferen Sinn, die Tragweite und den philosophischen Werth der Errungenschaften der positiven Sociologie zu würdigen. Wofür man kein Verständniss und keinen Sinn hat, das wird angefeindet. Das ist leider auch ein Gesetz des socialen Geschehens.

Fassen wir noch in aller Kürze die Einwände, die gegen die Anwendung der organischen Methode in der Sociologie vorgebracht worden sind, zusammen. Da diese Methode auf der Anerkennung der menschlichen Gesellschaft als eines individuellen Lebewesens, als eines realen Organismus fusst, so sind die Antiorganiker beflissen, zuvörderst den realen Charakter des socialen Geschehens zu negiren.

1. Die einzelnen socialen Gruppen und die Staaten als politische Einheiten bestehen nicht, erwidert man, aus fest zusammengefügt Geweben und Organen, wie die pflanzlichen und thierischen Organismen, sondern aus Personen, die sich frei im Raum bewegen, die unter einander nur ausnahmsweise und zufällig in unmittelbare substantielle Berührung gelangen, die den Verband, dem sie angehören, willkürlich verlassen und in andere Verbände treten, ja, die zu mehreren Gemeinschaften zugleich gehören können.

Alle Einwände, die auf Raum- und Zeitverhältnisse zurückzuführen sind, haben wir durch die vorhergehenden Auseinandersetzungen bereits widerlegt. Wie verhält es sich aber mit der nacheinanderfolgenden oder gleichzeitigen Zugehörigkeit desselben Individuums zu verschiedenen Gemeinschaften ?

Die socialen Verbände haben wir als Nervensysteme bezeichnet. Zwischen den Begriffen von Körper und System wird von der Naturkunde kein wesentlicher Unterschied statuirt. Ein jeder feste Körper stellt ein System von in Bewegung begriffener Atome und Moleküle dar, ebenso wie unser Sonnensystem aus Weltkörpern besteht. In beiden Fällen gehen die Bewegungen nach denselben mechanischen Gesetzen vor sich. Ganz ebenso entwickelt sich das sociale aus Individuen bestehende Nervensystem nach denselben Gesetzen, wie die vielzelligen Organismen und speciell wie das aus Neuronen bestehende individuelle Nervensystem. Wie im socialen, so giebt es auch in dem pflanzlichen und thierischen Organismus Wanderzellen, obgleich in geringerem Verhältniss zu denen, die in den festen Geweben und Organen gebunden sind. Daraus geht nun klar hervor, wie derselbe Mensch nach einander oder gar gleichzeitig zu zwei oder mehreren Verbänden gehören kann. Im Nacheinander geschieht es auf dieselbe Weise, wie das Hinüberirren der Kometen aus einem Weltsystem in das andere. Sollte nun aber ein Himmelskörper von der Grösse unserer Sonne sich uns nähern, so würde die von einem solchen Körper ausgeübte Anziehungskraft eine Störung des Gleichgewichts in unserem Sonnensystem hervorbringen. Die zum neuerschiedenen Himmelskörper näher gelegenen Planeten würden von ihm stärker als die übrigen angezogen sein. Es würde ein Kampf zwischen zwei Anziehungscentren entstehen und im Verlaufe dieses Kampfes würde ein Theil der Planeten zugleich von beiden Centren in ihren Bahnen beeinflusst werden; sie würden also zu beiden Systemen zu gleicher Zeit gehören. Eine solche Störung in den Gleichgewichtsverhältnissen der westeuropäischen Staaten hat im Mittelalter die Papstgewalt ausgeübt. Die Gemüther gravitirten

nach zwei entgegengesetzten Attractionscentren, zum Königthum, in Deutschland der kaiserlichen Gewalt, und zum Papstthum. Die Personen, deren Gemüth nach zwei Richtungen hin sich hingezogen fühlte, gehörten gleichzeitig zu zwei verschiedenen socialen Nervensystemen, deren Functionen nicht übereinstimmten und die zeitweilig auch im offenen Kampfe unter einander standen. Man vergesse aber nicht, dass die Zusammengehörigkeit der Individuen im Gesellschaftsverbande nicht durch mechanische, sondern durch psychophysische Energieen bestimmt wird. Die psychophysische Affinität ist das Band, das die Menschen aneinander in der Gesellschaft knüpft und das auch nur durch psychophysische Dissimilation gelöst werden kann. Im socialen Organismus entsprechen die geistigen und ethischen Energiebrennpunkte den Anziehungscentren der Schwerkraft, der durch Reflexe sich kundthuende sociale Energiewechsel der mechanischen Bewegung im Weltraum. Da aber die Spirale, nach welcher die Energieen sich zu höheren Potencirungen erheben, eine zwar allmählich aufsteigende, aber doch stets zu denselben parallelen Punkten wiederkehrende Orbite durchläuft, so finden sich auch in den höheren Sphären stets Entwicklungszustände, die mit den niederen übereinstimmen oder ihnen analog sind. Eine derartige Analogie stellen uns, abgesehen von der Höhe der Energiepotencien, die socialen und die mechanischen Systeme dar. So weitgreifend diese Analogie erscheinen mag, so wirft sie dennoch ein klares Licht auf das Geschehen im Weltraume und im socialen Leben.

In seiner aufsteigenden Bewegung auf der Spiralbahn zu höheren Entwicklungsstadien geräth der sociale Organismus auch in Hinsicht der Organismenwelt in perihelische und perigäische Stellungen, die ihn den niederen Organismen näher bringen, als den höheren Ordnungen der Lebewesen. So zeigt das sociale Nervensystem in Hinsicht auf die Beweglichkeit der einzelnen Elemente und die Veränderlichkeit der Structur so manche Analogieen mit den niederen Gattungen des thierischen Lebens. Das rechtfertigt den Vergleich des socialen Geschehens mit dem Werden in der ganzen Organismenwelt. Es müssen dabei nur auch stets die Differenzen in der Potencirung der Energieen gehörig gewürdigt und hervorgehoben werden. Und solches ist seitens der Organiker auch stets beobachtet worden. Es ist ihnen daher mit Unrecht der Vorwurf gemacht worden, dass von ihnen der sociale Organismus mit den natürlichen identificirt werde. Die Aufstellung einer Analogie implicirt noch keine Identificirung, sondern weist nur auf bestimmte Annäherungspunkte zwischen der Evolution des socialen Geschehens und dem Werden in der Natur hin.

2. Die sociale Individualität wird nicht, wie man behauptet, geboren und unterliegt nicht dem Tode, gleich den Einzelorganismen.

Alle gesellschaftlichen Verbände, alle Staaten, sind ursprünglich durch Theilung der bereits bestehenden entstanden. Das geschieht auch noch heutigen Tages bei jeder neuen Colonisation, die zu einem mehr oder weniger selbstständigen Gesamtleben der Tochtergesellschaft führt. Durch Theilung haben sich auch alle Naturorganismen ursprünglich vermehrt ; die Sporenbildung, die Befruchtung auf geschlechtlichem Wege sind nur Modificationen der ursprünglichen Vermehrung durch Theilung.

Man wird wohl erwidern, dass die meisten Staaten durch Eroberung gegründet worden sind. — Nun implicirt aber eine jede Eroberung ihrem Wesen nach einen Befruchtungsprocess. Beobachtet man, wie die Spermatozoen in zahlreichen Schaaren die weibliche Zelle umschwärmen und gewaltsam in dieselbe eindringen, so hat man ein Bild des Kampfes zwischen einer unternehmenden, beweglicheren, activen Bevölkerung und einer verweichlichten und passiven. Siegt erstere, so wird die besiegte Bevölkerung bezwungen, unterworfen, unterjocht, das passive weibliche Element von dem activen männlichen. Mit der Zeit vereinigen sich aber beide, verschmelzen in einander, und es entsteht ein neuer, umgewandelter Organismus, eine Einheit aus der Zweiheit. In einer solchen Umwandlung und Vereinheitlichung zweier Elemente besteht aber dein Wesen nach auch ein jeder natürlicher Befruchtungsprocess. Bei Aufstellung dieser Analogieen haben wir den ethischen Factor nicht in Berücksichtigung gezogen, obgleich

wir dessen Werth vollständig anerkennen. Bei der Mannichfaltigkeit jedes socialen Geschehens ist es unmöglich alle Factore bei jeder Auseinandersetzung von Neuem aufzuzählen.

Der Tod ereilt ebenso die socialen Verbände, ja ganze Staaten, wie auch die Einzelorganismen. Die Ausrottung durch Krieg, das Verschwinden von der Erdoberfläche in Folge tellurischer Kataklysmen ganzer Bevölkerungen fallen mit dem Tode der Gesamtheiten, die sie gebildet hatten, zusammen. Aber auch die allmähliche Auflösung einer Gesellschaft durch Krankheit, Desorganisation, Erschöpfung, Lähmung der Lebenscentren, Versiegung der Lebensquellen, ist möglich, obgleich diese Zustände nicht in so kurzer Zeit und unter so auffallenden Symptomen verlaufen, wie solches mit dem Individuum der Fall ist. Diese Zustände, ihre Entstehung und ihre Folgen haben wir in unserer Socialen Pathologie ausführlich beschrieben*). Eine Bevölkerung, die das Bewusstsein ihrer Einheit vollständig verloren hat, bildet nicht mehr ein organisches Uebereinander, sondern nur ein Nebeneinander, gleich den Bäumen eines Waldes und den Grashalmen einer Wiese. Als concreten Organismus hat eine solche Gesellschaft zu existiren aufgehört ; sie ist in ihre einzelnen Bestandtheile zerfallen ; sie bildet nur eine discrete Collectivität. Spencer und seine Anhänger halten aber ihrerseits sogar bewusst lebende Staatsverbände für discrete Collectivitäten. Zu welchen Einseitigkeiten eine solche Auffassung führt, haben wir bereits früher angedeutet.

3. Spencer hat die Einwendung erhoben, dass die Organismen, namentlich die zu den höheren Ordnungen gehörenden, symmetrisch gebaut sind, wogegen der sociale Organismus die Negation jeglicher Symmetrie darstellt.

Nun verfügt aber ein jeder selbstständige sociale Organismus über Centralorgane, um welche die verschiedenen Klassen der Bevölkerung sich schichtenweise, die höheren näher, die niederen entfernter lagern. Ein jeder Staat stellt eine Hierarchie von Zellen, Geweben und Organen dar, und in der Anordnung dieser Verbände zweiter, dritter u. s. w. Kategorien untereinander und in Hinsicht auf die Centralgewalten, bekundet sich gerade der symmetrische Bau jedes Staates. Die Anordnung und Symmetrie wird im socialen Organismus selbstverständlich nicht bloß durch mechanische und chemische Factoren, wie in den Naturorganismen, bewirkt, sondern auch durch psychische ; es waltet aber in Hinsicht auf die Symmetrie, wie auch in allem Geschehen, stets nur ein gradueller und kein absoluter Unterschied zwischen Gesellschaft und Einzelorganismus ob. — In unserer Schrift : *La Méthode graphique en Sociologie***) haben wir die concentrische Aufschichtung der verschiedenen socialen Elemente graphisch dargestellt und somit auf geometrischem Wege die Symmetrie in dem Bau der socialen Verbände bewiesen.

4. Die Gesellschaft, wendet man schliesslich ein, verfügt über kein gemeinsames Sensorium ; sie bildet kein bewusstes und selbstbewusstes Ich, wie jedes Individuum ; sie stellt nur eine Collectivität von Gefühls- und Bewusstseinszuständen dar.

Die positive Psychologie und namentlich die Psychiatrie sind zum Ergebniss gelangt, dass das individuelle Sensorium und Bewusstsein gleichfalls nur ein collectives ist, indem es als Resultat des Zusammenwirkens und -lebens aller den Organismus bildenden Zellenelemente angesehen werden muss. Das individuelle Bewusstsein bildet demgemäss eine sich stets verändernde Grösse ; jedes folgende Moment ist es ein anderes als im vorhergehenden ; es unterliegt Unterbrechungen, wie z. B. durch den Schlaf ; es ist ein periodisches, indem es stets zwischen erhöhten Spannungs- und Gleichgewichtszuständen schwankt ; es ist ausserdem ein wanderndes, indem es durch äussere Reize, Erinnerungen, innere Spannungen latenter Energieen aus einem Theil der Centralorgane in einen anderen hinübergetragen wird und zeitweilig an denselben haften bleibt. Allem diesem entsprechen auch die verschiedenen Gefühls- und Bewusstseinszustände der Gesellschaft. Sie stellen auch Collectivzustände dar, unterliegen

*) *La Pathologie Sociale*, Bd. II der *Bibliothèque sociologique internationale*.

**) In den Bänden III und IV der *Annales de l'Institut international de Sociologie*.

Unterbrechungen, periodischen Schwankungen, mannichfachen Wandelungen. Denn das sociale Zusammenfühlen, -denken und -wollen stellt nicht bloß eine Summirung der individuellen Zustände dar, sondern bildet das Resultat einer auf organischem Wege erlangten Vereinheitlichung und dasselbe ist auch in Hinsicht des individuellen Bewusstseins der Fall. Das sociale Bewusstsein ist dem individuellen nicht bloß analog, sondern zugleich auch homolog, indem es eine organische Potencirung der psychophysischen individuellen Energien darstellt. Diejenigen, die solches läugnen, müssen zuvörderst die Ergebnisse der Psychologie und Psychiatrie widerlegen ; bis solches nicht geschehen ist, ist der Sociolog berechtigt sich auf dieselbe zu stützen und die sociale Psychologie auf Grundlage der individuellen aufzubauen. —

Alle diese Einwendungen entspringen einer gemeinschaftlichen Quelle, nämlich dem Umstande, dass der sociale Körper oder, um unsere Terminologie beizubehalten, das sociale Nervensystem sich dem Beobachter nicht als eine plastische, durch bestimmte Formen begränzte Gestaltung darstellt gleichwie die Einzelorganismen, sondern als eine in Raum und Zeit discrete Collectivität. Wir haben gesehen, wie unbegründet und unwissenschaftlich eine solche Anschauung ist. Ein jedes einzelne Glied einer socialen Gesamtheit kann letztere als Ganzes durch seine Sinne ebenso wenig auffassen, wie eine Zelle den Zellenstaat, zu dem sie gehört. Die Gewebe, Organe und der gesammte Organismus stellen sich der einzelnen Zelle gewiss als ein Wirrsal von scheinbar ordnungslosen Bewegungen dar, an denen sie nur unbewusst und instinctiv theilnimmt indem sie die ihr obliegenden Functionen erfüllt. Obgleich nun der Mensch, als psychophysisch höher potencirtes Wesen, sich seiner Stellung im socialen Verbande mehr bewusst ist, so entgeht ihm dennoch ebenso die Gesetzmässigkeit des socialen Geschehens in seinem Zusammenhange wie der einzelnen Zelle, und als Beweis dafür möge die noch jetzt sogar von hervorragenden Geistern ausgesprochene Ueberzeugung dienen, dass es überhaupt keine Gesetzmässigkeit für das sociale Werden gebe. Um über die plastischen Formbildungen des socialen Körpers zu urtheilen, müsste der Mensch mit anderen Organen begabt sein, als über welche er jetzt verfügt. Aus demselben Grunde kann er sich auch kein Bild von der psychophysischen Vereinheitlichung des socialen Bewusstseins machen. Er fasst nur die Bewegungen und Functionen der einzelnen Factoren auf, die zur Herstellung desselben führen. Er fühlt, denkt und will nur als Individuum ; wie das Ganze fühlt, denkt und will, ist ihm eine unbekannte Grösse, obgleich er instinctiv, halbbewusst und nur ausnahmsweise bewusst zur Herstellung des Ganzen durch sein Wirken beiträgt, wie auch die Zelle im Zellenstaate.

Aber wie die Einheit der Weltsysteme nur in ungeheuren Entfernungen wahrnehmbar ist, so lässt sich das sociale Bewusstsein erklären und mit dem individuellen in Einklang bringen, wenn man es von der Höhe der religiösen Anschauung betrachtet. Das Christenthum lehrt : nicht ich fühle, denke und will, sondern eine höhere Macht in mir; in Gott leben, weben und sind wir. Ebenso fühlt, denkt und will, wenn man sich auf den religiöschristlichen Standpunkt stellt, nicht die einzelne Gesamtheit und die Menschheit als Ganzes, sondern es waltet Gott in jedem menschlichen Zusammenleben, sowie in der ganzen Geschichte der Menschheit. Möge dieser Ausblick dazu beitragen, die Ueberzeugung hervorzurufen, dass die organische Methode in der Sociologie nicht zu einer materialistischen, sondern, wenn richtig verstanden und angewandt, zu einer idealistischen Weltanschauung führt.

Obgleich nun die vorhergehenden Einwendungen als unbegründet anerkannt werden müssen, so tragen sie dennoch einen wissenschaftlichen Charakter an sich. Zu einer ganz anderen Kategorie von Einwendungen gehören diejenigen, die aus einer vollständigen Unkenntniss der Errungenschaften der heutigen Biologie und positiven Psychologie, sowie aus einer falschen und oberflächlichen Auffassung der organischen Methode selbst stammen.

Nur auf diese Weise lassen sich folgende von einigen Antiorganikern aufgeworfene Fragen erklären :

Was kann es Gemeinsames zwischen einem Elephanten und einer Monarchie, zwischen einem Wallfisch und einer Republik geben ?

Diese Frage wäre ebenso zu beantworten, als die etwa an einen Geologen oder Astronomen gerichtete Frage : was kann es Gemeinsames zwischen einem Sandkorn und dem Planeten Jupiter, zwischen einem Kieselstein und dem Polarstern geben ?

Die Antwort kann nur lauten : die Verschiedenheiten beruhen auf Raum-, Zeit- und Potenzverhältnissen, das Gemeinsame ist die Gesetzmässigkeit in dem Geschehen.

Ein anderer Antiorganiker stellt die Forderung, man möge ihm doch die Hände, die Füße, die Nase, die Augen und Ohren und die übrigen Glieder des socialen Organismus zeigen.

Da jeglicher gesellschaftliche Verband aus Individuen besteht, so schliesst er auch alle Energieen, durch welche das individuelle Leben bedingt wird, in sich. Im socialen Organismus walten demzufolge nicht blos psychische, sondern auch chemische und mechanische Kräfte, aber in einer anderen, den socialen Zwecken entsprechenden Anordnung und Zusammensetzung. Der sociale Organismus hat keine Hände und Füße, aber die psychophysischen Energieen, auf deren Wechselwirkung das vereinheitlichte sociale Leben beruht, lösen sich wie im Einzelorganismus, als letztes Resultat, schliesslich auch in mechanischer Arbeit aus, wie wir solches bereits auseinandergesetzt haben. So giebt es auch keine sociale Augen und Ohren, aber die specifischen Energieen, die sich in den Individuen zu diesen Organen differenciren, erfahren eine Steigerung im socialen Leben durch das vereinheitlichte Wirken einer grösseren oder geringeren Zahl von Individuen, die gemeinsam ihre speciellen Begabungen und Talente entwickeln und ausbilden. In diesem Sinne ist eine Akademie der Künste ein socialen Organ, welches in Hinsicht auf die plastischen Künste dem Sehvermögen, in Hinsicht auf die Tonkunst dem Gehör entspricht.

Ein französischer Pseudosociolog erkundigt sich sogar voller Besorgniss, wo die Secretionen des socialen Organismus bleiben und wo die Auswurfskanäle sich befinden. — Solche Antiorganiker wollen den socialen Organismus nicht blos sehen und betasten, sondern ihn auch noch riechen.

Eine ganz besondere Kategorie bilden diejenigen Kritiker der organischen Methode in der Sociologie, die, statt das Wesen derselben aufzufassen, sich damit begnügen, einzelne, möglicherweise unter hunderten von anderen, missglückte Analogieen zwischen dem Geschehen im socialen Leben und in der Organismenwelt hervorzuheben, um auf diesem Wege die Methode selbst anzugreifen. Ein solches Verfahren erweist sich um so leichter, als sogar alle Organiker noch lange nicht nach allen Richtungen hin in der Auffassung des socialen Geschehens übereinstimmen. Giebt man nun auch zu, dass von einigen Organikern einzelne Analogieen voreilig und oberflächlich aufgefasst worden sind, so kann dieses ebenso wenig als ein Beweis gegen die organische Methode in der Sociologie dienen als etwa die seitens einzelner Naturforscher gemachten ungenauen Beobachtungen und Experimente für die Unbrauchbarkeit der inductiven Methode in der Naturkunde vorgebracht werden könnten. Das grosse Publikum, das die theilweise sehr umfangreichen Werke der Organiker nicht liest, urtheilt über den Werth der organischen Methode nach diesen, aus dem ganzen Zusammenhange des Systems einzeln herausgerissenen Beispielen. Von diesem Schicksal werden übrigens alle neu aufgestellte sowohl philosophische, als auch naturwissenschaftliche Systeme erreicht. Gegen die Evolutionslehre Darwin's ist dasselbe Verfahren in Anwendung gebracht worden. Eine illustrierte Zeitung producirte eine Reihenfolge von Figuren: die erste stellte ein Weichthier dar, dann folgte eine Schlange, ein Krokodil, eine Gans, eine Giraffe, ein Esel, ein Affe und schliesslich ein moderner Stutzer in einem Paletot mit einem Cylinder auf dem Kopfe, einem Monocle im Auge und einer Cigarre im Munde. Diese Caricatur war mit der inhaltsreichen Aufschrift versehen : Die Evolutionstheorie Darwin's. Durch ein solches Verfahren kann ein wissenschaftliches System

nicht widerlegt werden, am wenigsten die organische Theorie in der Sociologie, da sie auf bereits erwiesene Errungenschaften der Biologie und der positiven Psychologie gegründet ist. Um jenes sociologische System zu erschüttern, müssen zuvörderst diese Errungenschaften als unbegründet anerkannt werden. Die Antiorganiker umgehen aber sorgfältig diese Seite des ganzen Systems, um nur einige vorgeschobene Punkte desselben anzugreifen. Mögen nun einzelne unter der Zahl dieser letzteren sich auch als zu schwach begründet erweisen, so bleibt doch die Citadelle stehen, in welcher die Hauptmacht des ganzen Systems concentrirt ist, nämlich die unauflösliche Verknüpfung alles Geschehens in der menschlichen Gesellschaft mit dem Werden in der Natur.

Die Grundthesis der Organiker : *nihil est in societate quod non prius fuerit in natura* kann ebenso wenig vom idealistischen, als auch vom materialistischen Standpunkte erschüttert werden. Denn die Idealisten müssten aus dieser Thesis zu dem Schluss gelangen, dass Gott in der Natur, wie auch in der Geschichte nach denselben Gesetzen waltet und seinen Willen kund thut. Die Idealisten könnten daher die Thesis durch den Zusatz *nisi Deus* vervollständigen, gleichwie die Spiritualisten zu der Thesis der Sensualisten : *nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu* das *nisi intellectus* hinzufügen. Indem die Materialisten das Walten höherer geistiger Kräfte läugnen, sind sie ihrerseits gezwungen sich auf dieselbe Thesis zu beziehen. Weder von der einen, noch von der anderen Seite können also die Grundlagen der organischen Theorie erschüttert werden.

Es ist mit Recht hervorgehoben worden, dass die Sociologie den Kampf mit den Vorurtheilen zu ihrer Devise hat. — Die Vorurtheile der modernen Gesellschaft entspringen nicht dem längst überwundenen Aberglauben an den bösen Blick, an Hexen und Teufel ; heutzutage werden sie genährt durch falsche wissenschaftliche Anschauungen, Parteigeist und politische Leidenschaften, die, wie die religiösen im Mittelalter, sich bis zum Fanatismus steigern. Die auf naturwissenschaftlicher Basis gegründete Sociologie hat nun gerade zu ihrer Aufgabe alle derartige Vorurtheile zu bekämpfen, woraus denn auch die Gründe klar werden, woher sie von so vielen Seiten mit Leidenschaftlichkeit und Rücksichtslosigkeit bekämpft und angefeindet wird.

Ehe wir weiter gehen, wollen wir auf die Bedeutung aufmerksam machen, welche die Anwendung der organischen Methode in der Sociologie auch für die Biologie und namentlich für die Physiologie haben könnte.

Ist die menschliche Gesellschaft ein realer Organismus, so muss sie den drei Normen alles Geschehens in der lebendigen Substanz unterworfen sein, nämlich dem Wechsel des Stoffes, der Form und der Energie. Herr Verworn bezeichnet das dem Energiewechsel zu Grunde liegende Princip als ein fortwährendes Aufspeichern potentieller chemischer Energie und ein Ueberführen derselben in andere Energieformen*). Im socialen Organismus potencirt sich die ursprüngliche chemisch-mechanische Energie zu specifischen psychischen Energieen und der Energiewechsel erhält in demselben den Charakter eines psychischen Energiewechsels. Letzterer wird seinerseits auch stets von einem entsprechenden Stoff- und Formwechsel begleitet, wie wir solches in den vorhergehenden Darlegungen ausgeführt haben. Das Geschehen im socialen Organismus ist also im Princip dasselbe wie in der ganzen Organismenwelt. Nun gehört aber die Energetik zu den dunkelsten und am wenigsten durchforschten Gebieten der Physiologie; die Umsetzungen der Energieen aus einer Form in die anderen sind noch lange nicht erklärt, ja, die Begriffe der einzelnen Energieformen sind bis jetzt noch nicht fixirt worden**).

*) Max Verworn : Allgemeine Physiologie, S. 558

**) Ebendas. S. 556.

Es frägt sich nun : sollte der in höheren Potentialen und auf breiterer Basis vor sich gehende sociale Energiewechsel, auf dem Wege des Vergleichs mit dem Geschehen in den Einzelorganismen, nicht einiges Licht auf letzteres werfen können ? Der Ausspruch von Johannes Müller : die Physiologie kann nur zu definitiven Resultaten führen, wenn sie eine vergleichende wird, müsste im umfassendsten Sinne durch Hinzuziehung des socialen Organismus in den Kreis des physiologischen Forschens seine Ausführung finden.

Die Embryologie stellt ein ebenso dunkles Gebiet dar, wie die Energetik. Man weiss wohl, dass die einfache Zelle sich durch Theilung vermehrt und in den Tochterzellen sich derselbe Process wiederholt, der in der Mutterzelle vor sich gegangen war. Aber auf welchem Wege in den vielzelligen Organismen die einzelne Zelle dazu gelangt die Evolution des ganzen Organismus, nachdem sie aus demselben als Keimzelle ausgeschieden worden ist, zu wiederholen, ist bis jetzt noch nicht klargelegt worden. In Deutschland theilen sich die Embryologen in zwei Lager : die Präformisten, His, Roux und Weissman, welche die Lehre von den organbildenden Keimbezirken vertreten, und andererseits die Anhänger der Epigenesislehre : Pflüger, Hertwig, Driesch und Häckel, die den äusseren Factoren bei der embryologischen Umbildung der Zelle die entscheidende Wirkung zuschreiben. In England hat Darwin seinerseits eine Pangenesis-theorie aufgestellt.

Das einfachste Zellenelement im socialen Organismus ist die Person. Die höheren Nervenorgane, die den Menschen vom Thiere unterscheiden, sind ein Product des vom Urmenschen an in der Gesellschaft im Verlaufe der ganzen vorhistorischen und historischen Entwicklung vor sich gegangenen psychophysischen Energiewechsels. Jedes einzelne Individuum tritt in Folge dessen als Kind in einen höheren Gesellschaftsverband mit bereits vorhandenen, von den Vorfahren angeerbten Anlagen ein. Dasselbe geschieht gleichfalls mit jeder einfachen Zelle, die im Schoosse eines vielzelligen Organismus geboren wird. Beide bringen angeerbte Anlagen mit, wenn auch von ungleicher Energieanhäufung ; beide müssen nach ihrer Geburt sich dem organischen Medium, zu dem sie gehören, anpassen, mit ihm in Wechselwirkung treten; sie werden durch die Reizwirkungen des Gesamtorganismus und seiner einzelnen Theile höher potencirt und in mannichfachster Weise differencirt. In beiden Fällen ist dieser Process seinem Wesen nach als ein Erziehungsprocess zu bezeichnen. Nun geht aber dieser Process in der Gesellschaft in weiteren Zeitabschnitten und in breiteren Raumverhältnissen vor sich. Somit könnte auch ein Vergleich des embryologischen Geschehens in der Organismenwelt mit dem, was in der Gesellschaft unter Erziehung im umfassendsten Sinne des Wortes verstanden wird, ein helles Licht auf das Gebiet des Entwicklungsmechanismus in der Physiologie werfen. —

Aus denselben Gründen könnte die sociale Organismenlehre auch der positiven Psychologie so manchen Dienst erweisen. Der sociale Energiewechsel schliesst sich den Ergebnissen der Innervation im individuellen Nervensystem unmittelbar an. Die Genesis des Fühlens, Denkens und Wollens im Individuum ist der des Zusammenfühlens, -denkens und -wollens im socialen Organismus vollständig homolog, daher auch das individuelle Nervensystem und dessen Reizwirkungen dem socialen Nervensystem und dessen Energiewechsel mittelst directer und indirecter Reflexe analog sein muss. Durch die Unterbrechung der socialen Innervation bei indirecter Reflexwirkung wird der Energiewechsel im socialen Nervensystem aufgehalten und in zwei besondere Actionen gespalten, wodurch der sociale Process der Innervation dem Beobachter klarer und bestimmter veranschaulicht wird, als solches im individuellen Nervensystem und namentlich im Gehirn, der in einem beschränkten Raume Millionen von Zellen umfasst, der Fall ist. Wir haben schon oben bemerkt, dass die Reizübertragung von einer Ganglienzelle zur anderen in unserem Gehirn nicht auf substantiellem Wege, wie solches zwischen den anderen Zellen der Fall ist, sondern durch indirecte Berührung vor

sich geht. Dieser Modus der Reizübertragung kann nur in Analogie der Wirkung der indirecten Reflexe im socialen Nervensystem erklärt werden. Daher muss auch die Psychologie in den Kreis ihrer Inductionen die sociale Organismenlehre einschliessen, um eine breitere Basis als vergleichende Wissenschaft zu gewinnen.

Nicht zu den geringsten Vorzügen der organischen Methode gehört die Auffassung der Gesellschaft als Zellenstaat, wodurch die Sociologie die Bedeutung einer Cellularsociologie erhält. Eine Cellularphysiologie und eine Cellularpsychologie sind noch im Entstehen begriffen. Der Sociolog beginnt also seinen Weg von dem Punkte, den zu erreichen jene Wissenschaften nur noch bestrebt sind. Der Sociolog könnte nun den Naturforschern und Psychologen die Erreichung des von ihnen ersehnten Zieles erleichtern indem er die Ergebnisse der Sociologie an die der Biologie anknüpft. — Unsererseits haben wir auch die sociale Pathologie als Cellularpathologie nach dem Vorgehen Virchow's aufgefasst.

Schon die Entdeckung der rein ökonomischen Gesetze hat den Werth derselben für die Biologie bewiesen. Das von Adam Smith auf ökonomischem Gebiete festgestellte Gesetz der Arbeitstheilung hat die Physiologen auf die Bedeutung desselben Principis für die Lebewesen aufmerksam gemacht. Darwin bezeugt, dass er die ersten Anregungen zu seiner Selectionstheorie durch das Werk von Malthus über das Bevölkerungsgesetz erhalten hat. Daher ist zu erwarten, dass durch die definitive Constituirung der Sociologie die Ergebnisse der sociologischen Forschungen eine noch nicht geahnte Bedeutung für die Naturkunde und speciell für die Biologie und die positive Psychologie, die als Theil der Biologie angesehen werden muss, erhalten werden.

Schliesslich muss auf die Erweiterung der Naturanschauung überhaupt in ihrem ganzen Umfange durch die Anknüpfung der Sociologie an die Naturkunde aufmerksam gemacht werden. Die Naturanschauung wird dadurch nicht blos an Breite, sondern auch an Tiefe gewinnen. Und jeder Gewinn an Tiefe in der Naturanschauung ist zugleich ein Gewinn für eine idealere Weltanschauung. Wir haben wiederholt auf die Bedeutung der organischen Methode nach dieser Richtung hin in unseren früheren Arbeiten hingewiesen und können auch den Leser hier nur auf dieselben verweisen.

Indem die organische Methode das Geschehen in der Gesellschaft und in der Natur unter einen gemeinschaftlichen Nenner zusammenfasst, trägt sie nicht blos zur Klärung, sondern auch zur Vereinfachung mancher Auffassungen nach beiden Seiten hin bei. Führen wir hier nur ein Beispiel an. Die Rechtsphilosophie entbehrt jetzt noch jeglicher natürlicher Grundlage. Von der Naturkunde theilt sie ein bodenloser Abgrund, den zu überbrücken sie bis jetzt ausser Stande gewesen ist. Indem nun die Sociologie, dank der Anwendung der organischen Methode, den Beweis liefert, dass das Rechtsleben im Staate den formbildenden Trieben in der Gesellschaft entspringt, die den morphologischen Energieen in den Einzelorganismen nicht blos analog, sondern auch homolog sind, so begründet sie nicht blos das ganze Gebiet der Rechtswissenschaften auf dem festen Boden der Naturkunde, sondern sie vereinfacht auch dadurch die Zugänge zu diesem Gebiete, die noch jetzt auf einem äusserst verwickelten und künstlich aufgeführten Bau logischer, ethischer und metaphysischer Postulate ruhen. Die in der Rechtssphäre hervortretenden Anomalieen sind ihrerseits, wie wir solches ausführlich auseinandergesetzt haben*), den histologischen Krankheitszuständen in den Einzelorganismen analog, gleichwie auch die ökonomischen den physiologischen und die politischen den vereinheitlichen Trieben und Tendenzen in den Einzelorganismen. Von dieser Seite eröffnet sich ein weites, noch unbearbeitetes Feld sociologischer Forschungen. —

*) S. La Pathologie Sociale Capitel IV, V und VI.

In Deutschland ist die organische Methode in der Sociologie, so viel uns bekannt, nur von Schöffle, obgleich unter manchem Vorbehalt, in Anwendung gebracht worden*). Als der hervorragendste Vertreter dieser Methode in Frankreich muss Rene Worms anerkannt werden**). In England ist Spencer und seine Schule, wie wir gesehen haben, auf halbem Wege stehen geblieben. In Italien findet die organische Methode nur wenig Anklang.

Auf weitere litterärhistorische Ausführungen müssen wir verzichten, um nicht aus dem Rahmen, welchen wir uns in dieser Studie vorgezeichnet haben, hinauszutreten.

In unseren Betrachtungen sind wir geflissentlich jeglichem Wortstreit aus dem Wege gegangen. Der bekannte Satz: wo die Begriffe fehlen, dort stellt zur rechten Zeit ein Wort sich ein, könnte in Anwendung an die Kritiker aller Zeiten folgendermassen ausgedrückt werden : wo die Beweise fehlen, dort stellt sich zur rechten Zeit ein Wortstreit ein. Da nun aber Worte, sie mögen auch noch so inhaltsleer sein, doch immer noch so manche Verwirrung, namentlich auf wissenschaftlichem Gebiete, bewirken können, so dürfen wir uns der Aufgabe nicht entziehen, die Vertheidigung der organischen Methode in der Sociologie auch nach dieser Seite hin aufzunehmen. —

Ein heftiger Streit ist in letzter Zeit unter den Sociologen über die Frage entbrannt, ob der gesellschaftliche Verband als ein Naturorganismus oder als ein Superorganismus aufgefasst werden müsse.

Mit dem Worte Superorganismus kann nun aber ein doppelter Sinn verbunden werden. — Fasst man die Gesellschaft als Superorganismus in dem Sinne auf, dass das sociale Geschehen nur eine höhere Potenz derselben Energieen darstellt, welche sich in der ganzen Organismenwelt kund thun, so wäre gegen eine solche Benennung auch vom Standpunkte der organischen Methode nichts einzuwenden. Man könnte mit ebenso viel Recht eine höhere Thierspecies als eine Superorganisation den niederen Thiergattungen und der Pflanzenwelt gegenüberstellen, wie auch das Nervensystem als eine Superorganisation im Vergleich mit dem Knochen- und Muskelsysteme bezeichnen. Fasst man jedoch diese Benennung nicht im relativen, sondern im absoluten Sinne auf, indem man dem socialen Geschehen eine der übrigen organischen Welt absolut verschiedene Gesetzmässigkeit zuschreibt, so spaltet man die Erscheinungswelt in zwei Hälften, die unter einander nichts Gemeinsames haben. Dann wird der Sociologie der feste Boden der Naturkunde entzogen und sie muss darauf verzichten für eine positive Wissenschaft zu gelten. Da nun aber die Superorganiker ausser Stande sind irgend welche Beweise für eine absolute Unterscheidung zwischen natürlichem und supersocialem Geschehen zu liefern, so arten ihre Gegensätze zu der organischen Lehre in ebenso viele Wortstreitigkeiten aus, die ihrer Natur nach sich als endlos erweisen, wie eine jede Bewegung im leeren Raume. —

Ebenso verhält es sich mit der von einigen Sociologen vorgeschlagenen Unterscheidung zweier Kategorieen von Energiepotencialen, durch welche dem socialen Geschehen ein doppelter Charakter verliehen wird. Ein jeglicher gesellschaftliche Verband soll nämlich, nach der Meinung dieser Sociologen, das Resultat einerseits von natürlichen Nothwendigkeiten sein und andererseits durch den freien Willen des Menschen bestimmt werden. Als natürliche Nothwendigkeiten werden dabei das physische Medium, die Nahrungsstoffe, die Schutzvorrichtungen, Zeugung, Wachsthum u. s. w. bezeichnet. Dagegen werden die socialen

*) Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers.

**) Rene Worms : Organisme et Societe.

Beziehungen (les relatifs sociaux nach der Terminologie der französischen und englischen Sociologen) durch entsprechende Bethätigungen des freien Willens einzelner oder aller Mitglieder des socialen Verbandes bestimmt. Auf dieser Anschauung beruht die ganze Lehre vom contrat social, als deren Hauptvertreter J. J. Rousseau angesehen werden muss. Wenn in dem einen Lande eine republikanische, in dem anderen eine monarchische Regierungsform eingeführt werden, wenn dort eine liberale Gesetzesbestimmung durch Abstimmung einer Volksversammlung oder eines Parlaments in Kraft tritt, hier durch den Willen des Monarchen eine Verordnung im conservativem Sinne als allgemein bindende Norm eingeführt wird, so geschieht solches, wie die Conventionalisten meinen, in Folge absolut freier individueller und socialer Willensacte, die durch keine Nothwendigkeiten beschränkt werden ; wogegen die Befriedigung der physischen Bedürfnisse der Individuen, sowie die rein materiellen Processe im socialen Leben von nothwendigen Naturgesetzen beherrscht werden.

Suchen wir nun uns Rechenschaft darüber abzugeben, in wiefern das Individuum und die Gesammtheit als freie und inwiefern sie als durch Nothwendigkeiten gebundene Wesen erkannt werden müssen. —

Durch das Bedürfniss des Athmens ist der Mensch in unmittelbarste Abhängigkeit von der ihn umgebenden Atmosphäre gestellt ; er kann nur äusserst kurze Zeit der Luft entbehren, auch für dieselbe kein Surrogat finden. Aber in Hinsicht auf die Nahrungsstoffe ist seine Wahlfreiheit schon eine grössere, eine noch grössere in Hinsicht auf alle Schutzvorrichtungen : Kleidung, Bauten, Waffen u. s. w. Der Umkreis der Selbstbestimmung erweitert sich noch für den Culturmenschen in Hinsicht auf Ortswechsel, Wahl und Erfindung der Productionsmittel, Austausch und Capitalisation von Werthgegenständen, Associationswesen u. s. w. Aber auch auf den höchsten Culturstufen wird die menschliche Freiheit insofern durch Naturnothwendigkeiten beschränkt werden, als zur Befriedigung nicht blos der physischen, sondern auch der psychischen Bedürfnisse des Menschen stets materielle Mittel nothig sein werden.

Andererseits ist das Individuum, sowie die Gesellschaft auch bei der Wahl und der Bestimmung der sogenannten relations sociales gleichfalls durch Nothwendigkeiten gebunden. Ein jeder gesellschaftliche Verband ist gezwungen sich hierarchisch zu constituiren, um zu einer Vereinheitlichung im Zusammenwirken aller seiner Theile zu gelangen ; eine jede Gesellschaft, besonders wenn sie sich als selbstständiger Staat ausgebildet hat, bedarf nothwendig zu seiner Existenz einer Regierung, also Centralorgane, welche die Vereinheitlichung bewirken und vorstellen. Ein jedes Regierungsorgan kann seinerseits, wie die Gesellschaft selbst, nur aus Personen bestehen, und diese sind an nothwendige Existenzbedingungen wie jede menschliche Persönlichkeit und der ganze Staat gebunden. Worin besteht nun die Freiheit der Glieder einer Gesellschaft in Hinsicht auf die Wahl einer republikanischen oder monarchischen Regierungsform ? Sie beschränkt sich auf die Bestimmung, ob das Centralorgan aus einer Vielheit von Personen oder aus einer einzelnen Person zu bestehen hat und auf die Wahl der Personen in einer Republik und einer Wahlmonarchie. Die Thätigkeitsäusserungen der Centralorgane, sobald sie in's Leben treten, werden ihrerseits wiederum durch mannichfache äussere und innere sociale Nothwendigkeiten bedingt. Eine jede Regierung ist gezwungen bei den von ihr getroffenen Maassnahmen die Beschaffenheit des Bodens, auf welchem die einzelnen Theile des socialen Nervensystems eingebettet sind, die von der Bevölkerung ererbten physischen und psychischen Anlagen, die historisch bereits präformirte typische Gestaltung der socialen Gewebe und Organe, die bereits erreichte culturelle Entwicklungsstufe u. s. w. zu berücksichtigen. Dasselbe hat seine volle Gültigkeit auch in Betreff aller Thätigkeitsäusserungen, die im Schoosse der Gesellschaft überhaupt, vor sich gehen. Könnte man einen Querschnitt in irgend welcher Richtung durch einen beliebigen socialen Körper thun, so würde man sich des Vorhandenseins der beiden Factoren, der Freiheit und der Nothwendigkeit, in allen Sphären des socialen Lebens überzeugen ; nur das Verhältniss zwischen Freiheit und Nothwendigkeit würde in den verschiedenen Sphären sich als ein wechselndes erweisen. Nun ist es gerade die Aufgabe

der Sociologie, als reiner Wissenschaft, die Nothwendigkeiten des socialen Geschehens, mit anderen Worten den nothwendigen Kausalzusammenhang der socialen Erscheinungen zu erforschen ; wogegen die Bestimmung darüber, wie der freie Wille des Menschen sich inmitten dieser Nothwendigkeiten zu bewegen hat, wie er den Kausalzusammenhang des socialen Geschehens ausnutzen soll um zweckmässig zu handeln und höhere Entwicklungsstufen zu erreichen, dem Staatsmann, im umfassendsten Sinne des Wortes, obliegt und den Gegenstand der Socialkunstreue bildet. —

Es sei hier nur noch bemerkt, dass in den meisten Fällen der einzelne Mensch sich Illusionen über das Maass der ihm zustehenden Freiheiten macht ; er fühlt oft nicht die zahlreichen Bande, durch die er an die Gemeinschaft gebunden ist durch Abstammung, Familienverhältnisse, Stellung, Beruf, religiöse Vorschriften u. s. w. Man vergesse eben nicht, dass ein jedes Individuum in eine bereits fertige Gemeinschaft hineingeboren wird, und dass eine jede Gemeinschaft ein Product historischen Geschehens ist, welches nicht blos durch Willensacte und Zufälligkeiten, sondern auch durch eine Fülle von Nothwendigkeiten in mannichfachster Weise bedingt worden ist. — Würden keine sociale Nothwendigkeiten obwalten, wie wäre es zu erklären, dass in vollständig von der übrigen Welt abgeschiedenen Culturcentren, wie z. B. im Aztekenstaat und Inkareich, dieselben staatlichen Typen an den Tag getreten sind, wie sich solche zu allen Zeiten in der alten Welt gestaltet haben. Das Aztekenreich war eine auf feudaler Grundlage fussende Wahlmonarchie, wie das frühere Polen, und das Inkareich eine auf demokratischer Grundlage aufgebaute unumschränkte Monarchie, wie das heutige China. Es giebt nur zwei reine Typen von Regierungsformen : Republik und Monarchie, sowie auch die ganze Erscheinungswelt uns entweder als Einheit oder Vielheit entgegentritt. Die übrigen Staatenbildungen stellen nur Zwischenformen dar, von denen die einen sich mehr der republikanischen, die anderen mehr der monarchischen Verfassung nähern. Die Azteken und die Inkas konnten nicht anders, als eine Wahl zwischen den einzelnen, durch die Gesetze des socialen Wachstums vorgeschriebenen Regierungsformen wählen. Desgleichen hatten sich die ökonomischen und Rechtsverhältnisse in jenen beiden Reichen ihrem Wesen nach nach denselben Normen gestaltet, wie solche auch die alte Welt früher gekannt hatte und noch jetzt in verschiedenen Ländern verwirklicht. Die Azteken und Inkas ahmten Niemandem nach, sondern gehorchten unausweichlichen Nothwendigkeiten des socialen Geschehens. Einer solchen Nothwendigkeit folgen auch alle religiösen Gemeinschaften, alle wirthschaftlichen Associationen, alle irgend welche gemeinsamen Zwecke verfolgende Vereine, so unstätt und wandelbar auch die Formen, die sie annehmen, sein mögen. Und solches geschieht aus dem Grunde, weil sie entweder selbst im Keime begriffene Staaten darstellen oder Bruchtheile von Staaten bilden, deren inneren Bau sie abgekürzt, mit allen wesentlichen Factoren reproduciren*). Es steht dabei jedem Individuum, jeder Gemeinschaft, sowie jeder Staatsgewalt frei zweckgemäss oder zweckwidrig zu wirken ; aber sie werden nicht den nothwendigen Folgen entgehen können, die ihre Handlungsweise nach sich ziehen muss. Im ersten Falle wird das Individuum und die Gemeinschaft in ihrer Entwicklung fortschreiten, höhere Culturstufen erreichen, im letzten Falle wird ihre Bewegung nothwendig eine rückschreitende sein, verschiedene pathologische Erscheinungen, Desorganisation, und schliesslich den Tod nach sich ziehen.

Dieselbe unlösbare Verknüpfung zwischen Freiheit und Nothwendigkeit thut sich auch im Ameisen- und Bienenstaat kund, nur ist in denselben ein sehr viel engerer Spielraum der Freiheit, in Folge der niedrigen Entwicklungsstufe dieser Staatenbildungen, angewiesen. Der Ameisenstaat ist eine Republik, der Bienenstaat muss als eine Monarchie angesehen werden. Die

*) S. meine Studie : *Ya-t-il une loi de l'évolution des formes politiques ?* in dem Bd. II der Annales de l'Institut international de Sociologie.

Bienenkönigin wird gewählt und zur Ausübung ihrer Functionen erzogen. Die Wahl kann auch eine unglückliche sein, wie in jeder Wahlmonarchie. Ein Irrthum kann aber nur obwalten wo Freiheit, sie mag auch noch so beschränkt sein, vorhanden ist. Das Thier kann sich auch als Individuum, gleichwie der Mensch, in der Wahl seiner Nahrung, seines Wohnsitzes, seines Weibchens, seiner Vertheidigungs- und Angriffsmittel irren. Es genießt also auch nach dieser Richtung einer gewissen Freiheit, obgleich ihr engere Grenzen gezogen sind als dem Menschen, besonders aber dem Culturmenschen.

Aus dem Vorhergesagten folgt nun, dass die Unterscheidung der Thätigkeitsäusserungen des Individuums und des socialen Organismus in zwei Kategorien, von denen die eine durch nothwendige Naturgesetze und die andere durch den freien Willen des Menschen bestimmt werden, jeden realen Inhalts entbehrt ; es ist eine nur auf Wortbestimmungen begründete Classification, die dadurch auch nur zu Wortstreitigkeiten Veranlassung geben kann. Der contrat social war eine historische Hypothese, wie das goldene Zeitalter und andere Utopieen. Auf solchen Hypothesen darf eine positive Wissenschaft ihre Forschungen nicht begründen. —

Zu den auf inhaltsleere Wortbestimmungen zurückzuführenden Classificationen der socialen Erscheinungen müssen überhaupt alle diejenigen zugezählt werden, die nicht den in der Biologie bereits festgestellten Kategorien entsprechen. Ein solches Verfahren führt stets zur Lostrennung der Sociologie von ihrer natürlichen Basis, der Biologie und der positiven Psychologie. Alle socialen Energieen müssen, bei Anwendung der organischen Methode, in ihrer Bedeutung als Potenzen der biologischen Energieen, erforscht werden ; sie einer anderen Classification als dieser zu unterziehen, könnte nur Verwirrung bei der Durchführung von Analogieen zwischen dem socialen und organischen Geschehen nach sich ziehen. Wir haben unsererseits die socialen Erscheinungen und Bethätigungen unter drei Kategorien zusammengefasst : die ökonomischen, juridischen und hierarchisch-politischen. Diese Kategorien entsprechen einerseits der Eintheilung der Biologie in Physiologie, Morphologie und Tektologie (Anthropologie, Zoologie, Botanik), andererseits den jetzt bereits bestehenden speciellen Disciplinen, welche die Gesellschaft zu ihrem Gegenstande haben : Nationalökonomie, Rechtswissenschaft, Politik (Staatswissenschaft im engeren Sinne). Vermittelst dieser Classification knüpft die Sociologie eine jede dieser Disciplinen an die entsprechende biologische Erscheinungssphäre und weist sie auf den natürlichen Boden hin, dem sie erwachsen ist. Der jetzt auf sociologischem Gebiete herrschende Wirrwarr wird nur dann ein Ende nehmen, wenn die behufs Erforschung des socialen Geschehens vorgeschlagenen Classificationen biogenetisch begründet sein werden. Im entgegengesetzten Falle werden sie nur zu endlosen Wortstreitigkeiten führen, wie solche auch jede nur auf inhaltsleeren Wortbestimmungen begründete Terminologie nach sich zieht. —

Auch die neu aufgetauchte Lehre vom geschichtlichen Materialismus kann Veranlassung zu vielfachen Wortstreitigkeiten geben. — Der sociale Energiewechsel wird stets, wie wir solches bereits bewiesen haben, von mechanischen und chemischen Auslösungen und Neubildungen materieller Bestandtheile sowohl im individuellen als auch im socialen Nervensystem begleitet. Es kann daher von einer Oekonomie des socialen Nervensystems in demselben Sinne die Rede sein, wie von einer Physiologie des individuellen Nervensystems und speciell des menschlichen Gehirns. Die Anhänger des geschichtlichen Materialismus fassen aber die Oekonomie des socialen Geschehens nicht in einem so umfassenden Sinne auf, denn sonst würde ihre Lehre mit der der Organiker zusammenfallen. Unter socialer Oekonomie verstehen die Geschichtsmaterialisten das wirtschaftliche Leben im engeren Sinne, nämlich die Aneignung, Production, Vertheilung und Consumption von Gütern, die vorzugsweise dazu bestimmt sind, den physischen Bedürfnissen Befriedigung zu gewähren und unter dem allgemeinen Begriffe von Nährstoffen und Schutzvorrichtungen zusammengefasst

werden. Nun können aber Nahrungsstoffe und Schutzvorrichtungen im socialen, wie auch im individuellen Organismus nicht unmittelbar Reflexe produciren, sondern müssen, nachdem sie vom Individuum assimilirt worden sind und das Individuum sich denselben angepasst hat, zuvor in psychische Energieen umgewandelt werden. Wie weit aber der Weg von der Assimilirung der Nährstoffe bis zur Ausbildung derjenigen Nervenorgane abliegt, die als die materiellen Träger der höheren psychischen Energieen anzusehen sind, geht daraus hervor, dass diese Organe, dem socialembryologischen Gesetze gemäss, im Individuum nur nach Recapitulirung der ganzen vorhergehenden psychischen Entwicklungsgeschichte seiner Vorfahren zur vollen Reife gelangen. Die tieferen Motive des Fühlens, Denkens und Wollens eines jeden Individuums liegen also in ungeheurer Ferne von dem, was er isst oder was seine Vorfahren gegessen haben. Jene höheren Nervenorgane sind ein Resultat des socialen Lebens, ein Product der Reflexwirkung des socialen Nervensystems. Sprache und Kunst, die ihrem Wesen nach auch nichts Anderes, als ein veranschaulichtes Sprechen ist, bilden die Mittel, durch welche der Energiewechsel im socialen Nervensystem vor sich geht. Dieses lebt und wirkt, entwickelt und differencirt sich nur in Folge ununterbrochener Auslösungen und neuer Aufspeicherungen von Energiepotencialen seitens der Individuen und letztere werden ihrerseits wiederum durch die im socialen Nervensystem vor sich gebenden Reflexe zur Thätigkeit angeregt. Als das Hauptmittel, durch welches auf dem Wege der Reflexe das Zusammenfühlen, -denken und -wollen der Menschen bewirkt wird, ist, wie gesagt, die Sprache. Daher glauben wir berechtigt gewesen zu sein, die Thesis aufzustellen : der Mensch ist als Culturwesen zu dem geworden, was im Verlaufe der Geschichte der Menschheit gesprochen worden ist. Die menschliche Cultur in ihrer Gesamtheit kann daher ebenso wenig als Resultat des wirthschaftlichen Geschehens wie die höheren Anlagen des Individuums als unmittelbares Product der Nahrungsstoffe anerkannt werden. Man müsste gerade das Gegentheil behaupten, nämlich dass das wirthschaftliche Leben, zum wenigsten was Form und Culturstufe anbetrifft, durch die individuellen und socialen Energiepotencialen bestimmt wird. So lange Australien nur von Australnegern bewohnt war, erhob sich das wirthschaftliche Leben dort nicht über das Niveau des Urmenschen. Es erreichte die jetzige Culturstufe nur in Folge der psychischen Energieen über die die europäischen Ansiedler verfügten. Und auf demselben Wege ist die Cultur zu allen Zeiten vorgeschritten*). —

Schliesslich wäre noch Folgendes hervorzuheben :

Die organische Methode in der Sociologie ist keine neue Erfindung. Der Stifter der christlichen Religion hat sie in seinen herrlichen Gleichnissen bereits in Anwendung gebracht. Indem Jesus sein sociales Ideal durch Beispiele aus der Organismenwelt erläuterte, legte er den Grund zur positiven Sociologie. Würden seine Gleichnisse nur Allegorien und rhetorische Figuren darstellen, so hätte ihre Wirkung keine so ergreifende und tiefgehende sein können. Jesus hat die Erscheinungswelt nicht als schwärmerischer Bewunderer von Naturschönheiten betrachtet, sondern als tiefblickender Erkenner der in allen Naturerscheinungen sich kundthuenden weisen Gesetzmässigkeit und ihrer unlösbaren Verknüpfung mit dem socialen Geschehen. Die christliche Theologie hat dieses ursprünglich intuitive Erkennen weiter durchgeführt, indem sie die Kirche als den erweiterten Leib Christi, als ein mit höheren Organen und Gaben begnadigtes Individuum, als einen durch höher potencirte psychische Energieen belebten realen Organismus aufgefasst hat. Wir haben in unserer „natürlichen Theologie“ den Versuch gemacht, den Parallelismus zwischen der christlichen Lehre und den Ergebnissen der positiven Sociologie nach dieser Richtung hin zu beleuchten. Wir haben solches zu unternehmen gewagt in der Ueberzeugung, dass die christliche Lehre nur dann in ihrer vollen Bedeutung und Tiefe wird erfasst werden können, wenn sie auch auf wissenschaftlichem Gebiete wird als Wahrheit anerkannt werden.

*) Hr. L. Stein stellt wiederholentlich, in seiner Kritik der organischen Methode, der mechanischen und chemischen Nothwendigkeiten unmittelbar die ethischen Imperative entgegen, die als Norm für das sociale Geschehen dienen sollen. Zwischen diesen Normen und jenen Nothwendigkeiten, welche die anorganische Natur beherrschen, liegt aber das grossartige Gebiet der biologischen Nothwendigkeiten und um diese handelt es sich gerade in der positiven Sociologie. Letztere ist weit davon entfernt, das ganze sociale Geschehen mechanisch oder chemisch erklären zu wollen, da sogar die einfacheren Lebensprocesse in der Natur nicht auf die ausschliessliche Wirkung mechanischer und chemischer Kräfte zurückgeführt werden können. Nun sagt der Hr. Verfasser : „Da die kirchlichen Imperative immer mehr zu verblassen die Tendenz zeigen und auch die staatlichen ihre frühere Consistenz bedenklich eingebüsst haben, so muss die Sociologie ihr Absehen darauf richten, eine Normwissenschaft zu werden, d. h. teleologisch motivirte Imperative zu formen“ (S. 33). Die socialen Imperative fasst der Hr. L. Stein in seinem Werke : Die sociale Frage im Lichte der Philosophie (S. 705) schliesslich in der Formel zusammen. „Handle so, dass du in jeder deiner Handlungen nicht blos dein eigenes sondern zugleich das Leben deiner Mitmenschen bejahst, insbesondere aber das der künftigen Geschlechter sicherst und hebst.“ Ob diese allgemeine Formel die Zehn Gebote und die Bergpredigt ersetzen könne, ist sehr fraglich. Aber es handelt sich hier zuvörderst um die Frage : gehört es zur Aufgabe der Sociologie, solche Normen zu bestimmen und sich an die Stelle der Religionslehre und der Moral zu setzen ? — Die Folge davon wäre, dass die Sociologie sich den Charakter einer religiösen und moralischen Wissenschaft anlegen würde. Es giebt nun wohl eine Wissenschaft der Religionen, eine wissenschaftliche Ethik, aber eine religiöse oder moralische Wissenschaft wären Undinge. Die Benennung selbst schliesst bereits einen inneren Widerspruch in sich. Wenn der tieferblickende Organiker schliesslich zu denselben Imperativen, wie solche in den Zehn Geboten, in der Bergpredigt, ja, in der Formel des Hrn. L. Stein enthalten sind, gelangt, so geschieht solches auf dem Wege der Forschung biologischer Nothwendigkeiten und nicht in der Ausübung eines Apostelamts oder einer Moralpredigt.

Was die Zwecknothwendigkeit, die der Hr. Verfasser als Ausgangspunkt für die sociale Normwissenschaft anerkannt wissen will, betrifft, so bemerken wir unsererseits, dass nicht blos die menschlichen Gesellschaften, sondern auch die ganze Organismenwelt bestimmte Zwecke verfolgt. Woher sollte bei solcher Bewandniss die Biologie, gleich der Sociologie, nicht auch eine Normwissenschaft werden ? Dient sie doch nicht blos an und für sich, sondern auch in ihrer Anwendung, als Kunst, bestimmten Zwecken (Hygiene, Therapie, Psychiatrie, Land- und Forstwirthschaft, Geflügel- und Viehzucht, Garten- und Obstbau etc.). Damit aber die Ausübung dieser Künste möglich sei, müssen zuvörderst die biologischen Gesetze ergründet und festgestellt sein und das ist Sache der Wissenschaft. Ganz ebenso giebt es eine Socialkunstlehre (Finanz- und Staatswirthschaftslehre, Jurisprudenz, Diplomatie, Kriegskunde etc.) und da das Zweckmässigkeitsprincip im socialen Organismus, seiner höheren Natur wegen, stärker hervortritt, so hat auch das sociale Können dem Müssen gegenüber einen freieren Spielraum ; aber es ist dennoch an biologische Nothwendigkeiten gebunden und solches aus dem Grunde, weil die menschliche Gesellschaft nicht blos eine ideale Organisation darstellt, sondern ein realer Organismus ist. Da zum Wesen jeglicher Wissenschaft die Erforschung der nothwendigen Gesetzmässigkeit der Erscheinungen gehört, so ist es gerade die Aufgabe der Sociologie, die biologischen Nothwendigkeiten des socialen Geschehens zu ergründen und festzustellen. In dem Maasse als die Sociologie die socialen Zwecke zum Gegenstande ihrer Forschungen erwählt, verliert sie daher ihren rein wissenschaftlichen Charakter und verwandelt sich in eine Staatskunstlehre. Als solche macht sie alsdann auch Ansprüche die Moral und sogar die Religion zu ersetzen, wie solches mit St. Simon und Aug. Comte der Fall war. Die Organiker ihrerseits erheben keine Ansprüche für Staatskünstler zu gelten. Sie beschränken sich darauf, die Gesetzmässigkeit des socialen Geschehens zu erforschen. Möge alsdann die Socialkunstlehre die Ergebnisse ihrer Forschungen zu den ihr vorgezeichneten Zwecken verwenden.

Den pädagogischen und erzieherischen Werth der organischen Methode haben wir in unserer Socialen Pathologie*), sowie in unserer Graphischen Methode in der Sociologie**) ausführlich hervorgehoben. Jeglicher, der durch Schule und Erziehung zum klaren Bewusstsein gelangt, dass die menschliche Gesellschaft ein lebendiges Individuum ist, wird die Pflichten, die ihn an die Gemeinschaft binden, tiefer, wahrhafter und umfassender empfinden und ausüben, als derjenige, für den der Staat mit seiner hierarchischen Organisation nur eine allegorische Figur darstellt ohne innere reale Wesenseinheit. Jedermann, der das sociale Geschehen als einen vereinheitlichten Lebensprocess auffasst, wird eine klarere Vorstellung vom socialen Müssen, Sollen und Können erlangen, als derjenige, der sich nur um fragmentarische Kenntnisse auf sociologischem Gebiete beworben hat oder nur zu einseitigen Anschauungen, ökonomischen, juridischen oder politischen, gelangt ist. Es kann auch nur derjenige Staatsmann schöpferisch wirken, der das ihm anvertraute Gemeinwesen nicht als einen abstracten Begriff, sondern als einen realen, durch gesetzmässig wirkende psychophysische Energieen belebten Organismus behandelt.

Wir haben eben angeführt, dass theologisch die christliche Kirche als erweiterter Leib Christi und daher als ein von einer lebendigen Wesenseinheit durchdrungener realer Organismus aufgefasst wird, daher denn auch die Glieder der kräftiger zusammengefügt und einheitlicher constituirten Kirchengemeinschaften, wie die katholische und griechische, sich ihrer Solidarität mit der Gesamtheit fester und klarer bewusst sind, als die Glieder loser aufgebauter religiöser Gemeinschaften und die Angehörigen eines Staates. Nicht blos der ideale Charakter der christlichen Lehre, sondern auch der reale Aufbau der christlichen Kirchen, führt zu diesem Ergebniss. Eine Idee erhält nur dann einen socialen Werth, wenn sie in's Fleisch und Blut einer bestimmten Zahl von Individuen übergeht, wenn sie sich im socialen Nervensystem incarnirt. Ein jedes Ideal muss sich in höheren individuellen Energiepotentialen und in höheren Formen des socialen Lebens ausprägen, um als ein sociales anerkannt zu werden. Auch jeder Staat verfolgt seinerseits ideale Zwecke, aber er stellt zugleich einen Körper, ein System von mechanisch, chemisch, physiologisch und psychophysisch wirkender Energieen dar, und die Erforschung dieses Geschehens bildet gerade den Gegenstand der positiven Sociologie, wobei die organische Methode ihr als sicherer Leitfaden auf den unendlich verschlungenen Wegen des socialen Werdens dienen soll. Die positive Sociologie bezweckt also das wissenschaftlich zu beweisen und den Geistern durch Schule und Lehre einzuprägen, was die christliche Lehre bereits als Wahrheit anerkannt hat.

Die genialen Gesetzgeber und Volksführer aller Zeiten : Lykurgos, Solon, Numa, Karl und Alfred, Peter und Friedrich die Grossen fühlten sich alle als Energiecentren lebendiger Collectivwesen, die sie neu zu organisiren oder organisch umzugestalten berufen waren. Sie waren also alle, dem Wesen ihrer Thätigkeit nach, Organisatoren. Wären sie nur Oekonomisten, Juristen oder Politiker gewesen, so würden sie als einseitig wirkende Spezialisten auf keine staatsmännische Genialität Anspruch erheben dürfen. Hätten sie in ihrem Wirken nur die Gegenwart berücksichtigt und nicht die ganze vorhergehende Evolution der Gesamtheit als einer realen Individualität aufgefasst, sowie auch ihren zukünftigen organischen Entwicklungsgang durchschaut, so hätten sie nichts Lebensfähiges geschaffen, sondern nur flüchtige Begebenheiten oder ephemäre Umgestaltungen hervorgerufen. Die Sociologie ruft die Wirklichkeit des socialen Geschehens in's klare Bewusstsein, wie solche von jeher den hervorragenden Geistern stets unbewusst oder halbbewusst vorgeschwebt hat. Auch die Naturkunde kann nur das erforschen, was die Erscheinungswelt ihr bietet und was als Object jeglichem Erkennen und Wirken des Menschen stets gedient hat. Die jetzigen Organiker sind

*) S. 298 u. f.

**) Bd. III der Annales de l'Institut international de Sociologie, S. 86.

Organisationslehrer wie die leitenden Staatsmänner aller Zeiten praktische Organisatoren waren.

Eine positive Wissenschaft ohne Object ist ein Unding. Soll die Sociologie die menschliche Gesellschaft als Gesamtheit erforschen, so muss sie vor Allem den realen Charakter der Gesamtheit anerkennen. Der Sociologie ist mit Recht die Würde einer selbstständigen Wissenschaft abgesprochen worden, so lange ihr das eigentliche Object ihrer Forschung fehlte. Dank der organischen Methode ist dieses Object, die reale Individualität des Menschenstaates, entdeckt worden und in's Bewusstsein, wenn auch einer nur geringen Zahl von Forschern getreten. Mit der Verläugnung dieses Objects verläugnet die Sociologie sich selbst als selbstständige Wissenschaft. Es kann dann keine Sociologen, sondern nur Anthropologen, Ethnographen, Oekonomisten, Rechtslehrer, Culturhistoriker geben. Da aber unter diesen einige durchaus für Sociologen gelten wollen, so sind in letzterer Zeit solche Zwitterwissenschaften entstanden, wie Anthroposociologie, Ethnosociologie, Rechtssociologie, Socialökonomik, Socialphilosophie der Geschichte etc. aufgetaucht. Damit solche Zwischendisziplinen auf Existenzberechtigung Anspruch machen dürften, ist jedoch vor Allem die Existenz einer Sociologie mit Anerkennung ihres Objectes, des Menschenstaates, nothwendig. Jene halben Sociologen erkennen aber dem Menschenstaate keine Individualität zu, sondern nur den Personen, aus welchen er besteht, und allenfalls noch der menschlichen Gattung. Sie vergessen aber dabei, dass auch eine jede Person nur ein Collectivwesen ist, das aus Zellen besteht, die Zellen ihrerseits aus Molekülen und diese aus Atomen, deren Existenz bis jetzt noch kein Naturforscher hat constatiren können. Mit demselben Rechte wie die Individualität des Staates könnte man daher auch die Individualität jeder einzelnen Person, ja sogar jeder Zelle und jedes Moleküls negiren. Die Verneinung der Individualität des Menschenstaates hat zur Folge, dass alles sociale Geschehen nur als Begriffsbestimmung aufgefasst wird und dass die sociologische Terminologie und die Classificationen der socialen Erscheinungen nur auf Begriffe zurückgeführt werden. Diese Begriffe werden schliesslich als Realitäten anerkannt und erhalten die Bedeutung von Idolen, die Bacon als diejenigen *impedimenta* bezeichnet, die den Weg zu jeglicher objectiven Forschung versperren. Eine Polemik zwischen einem Organiker und solchen subjectiven Sociologen ist ebenso fruchtlos, wie zwischen einem Naturforscher und einem Metaphysiker. Erster steht auf festem Boden und erforscht das Werden der Erscheinungen Schritt vor Schritt vom einfacheren zum mannichfaltigeren vorgehend. Der subjective Sociolog und der Metaphysiker schweben in einem luftleeren Raume auf den Schwingen abstracter Begriffe. Solcher Schwingen bedarf wohl der Dichter und der Künstler ; der Forscher muss aber darum stets beflissen sein, den festen Boden unter den Füßen nicht zu verlieren. Und für den Sociologen ist dieser feste Boden die Naturkunde. Daher schliessen wir mit dem Satze, den wir bereits am Anfange dieser Studie angeführt hatten : Sociologus nemo nisi biologus.

Introduction to the Translation

This translation was done using my computer. According to the file on CD it was produced on 4th November 2004, which is just over five years ago. I do not recall how much work I put into this item, it looks fairly passable, but obviously done roughly to provide an impression of the argument Lilienfeld was putting forward. I was very taken with Lilienfeld in the early years of my discovery of the lost science of sociology. I offer it for what it is worth, the item has never been translated from the original German, which I also provide here, above.

Originally I did not put the German text together as a whole, I used the individual pages, translated one at a time, to produce the English text, having now decided to post this work to Scribd I have been obliged to put the German text together and while doing this yesterday, 21/11/2009, I examined the text as I went and made a few corrections. The end product should be close to perfect, although as I have no German I could not spot any errors through understanding the meaning.

As I am currently on the 'torture run', as I like to call it, a programme for the criminally unemployed, as I like to describe the position I am in, I am forced to spend my days in an underground pit, working with antique computers, where I hope to do a little of my own work when I can snatch moments away from my overseers, who are there to make us drudge. I think these junk machines should be able to cope with my working on this text, as I have decided to read the translation below and make a few remarks at the end, picking up areas where Lilienfeld seems to mention things that are of interest to our atheist science agenda.

I put the whole German text through the translator yesterday and the result was more mashed than I anticipated, it is not possible to redo the translation therefore, I will of spent a long time on it originally, and we will have to make do with it as it is.

Finally, I notice that the bibliography to *German Sociology* by Philip Jacobs, 1909, says of this work : "Briefest and best statement of Lilienfeld's theory in book form." (p. 100.) Just a shame no one could be bothered translating it for us then !

In Support
of the
Organic Method
in
Sociology

by
Paul v. Lilienfeld.

With Commentary
by
Howard Hill



Berlin,
Printing and Publishing House of Georg Reimer.
1898.

GODLESS HOUSE
Posted to Scribd Sunday, 27 December 2009

P r e f a c e.

Formulating the method of teaching sociology was the main objective of the deliberations of the Third International Sociological Congress, that met the previous year in Paris, that I had the honour to preside over. The work of the Congress appeared in the fourth volume of the *Annals of the International Institute of Sociology* which were recently published in Paris. — Concerning the method of teaching itself the Congress represented different, opposing views. Comparing the organic, psychological, historic, statistical, the anthropological and ethnographic methods, each found its defender. At the same time few were concerned with the type and manner of the action under investigation in a social event, but rather, to be more precise therefore, whether sociology should be joined as a positive science to biology or if it was supposed to be acknowledged as one discipline separated by the nature of its subject.

The importance of this question moved me to publish the existing writing. I make the latest results from physiology and positive psychology the starting point of my reasoning ; I was however only fleetingly able to consider my philosophical views in this work and must forgo so many propositions that have not previously been drawn from me, and have yet to emerge. For the same reason, I was often obliged during the progress of my discussions to base their establishment upon my chief work : *Thoughts Concerning the Social Science of the Future*, [Five vols. 1873-1881.] as well as calling upon my more recently published monograph.

The interest, evoked by sociology in Germany recently, will hopefully not be lacking, and will focus fresh powers upon the area of this science and with their aid the important question about the sociological method will be brought to a conclusion.

St. Petersburg, March 1898.

The author.

Since people evolved from the animal state, into that of the human being, they have always lived as an association of equals. Human associations acquired their unique gifts and psychic energies, only by means of interaction between individuals. Only through the social life, does the prehuman become the primitive human, and so on to the cultured human. Along with the emergence of the individual therefore, human society also emerged. In the needs, and strivings of intellectual beings, the ancient human was the higher animal species, and they occupied a closer relationship to the natural environment than their successors, but they already obeyed the same social regulations as the cultured person of today. For this reason human society, as it came into being, followed the same constitutional laws, giving it the same essential appearances as the developments of the most refined country of modern times. During all the historical phases ordering the development of humanity, the conscious elements of the individual interactions, occurring between single members of society, remained valid, continued to constitute its internal construction, and continued to order relations with the outside world according to that consciousness. The transition from a low stage of development to a higher proceeded through imperceptible gradations such that they scarcely bore notice. External conflict between groups led to conquest and political upheavals, certainly, and led to the extermination of entire peoples and races, so how could just a few collisions between individuals contradict this impression. Victory, for its part, represents a capital historically acquired only gradually, by personal physical and psychic energies. It therefore only ever concerned an external displacement and annihilation of the weaker, underdeveloped elements, through the quantitatively or qualitatively stronger or higher elements. But the latter, being also subject to divine determinants and other physical and social influences, only gradually emerged. The place of the weaker and lower elements, are also determined only through social evolution. As one pursues the origin and the developmental properties of the stronger and higher social elements in their causal connections, one convinces oneself that the transitions from the low to the higher were always only gradual. —

In what ratio are the laws now set, through which the development of the human group is placed, in relation to the general laws of the inorganic and organic forces that are determined by nature ?

First of all it must be decided whether it is logically possible, as a general principle, to acknowledge the existence, side by side, of two systems absolutely divided by their own distinct set of laws, through which the causal connection of what appears, is determined. If established, the appearance of the world must be split into two absolutely different halves. However, the material world represents an eternal flowing of energies, at some boundary of the collective current a temporary balance occurs, an apparent hardening of the forces, delivering the solid form of physical bodies, yet always there is the fluidness of the collective division, and how is the origin of both derived from one and the same collective current. The same applies to the present condition of the uniquely human attribute, in certain respects, that of becoming a self-developing living being. Collective descent from a common origin of life, up to the boundary of inorganic nature, with which life's descent flows together, can be followed. The metaphysical knife is hardly designed in order to split the world of appearances at a point, this is not the object of the operation of perception, observation flows together with the other elements of a situation. One naturally attempts to divide the Subject and Object, of the internal and external world. But the person is at the same time Subject and Object. The world of appearance can only be divided through the avoidance of subjective reflection, but the senses themselves form divisions of the human body, and this again is only a divide of the world of appearances. Therefore it is impossible, either from the subjective or from the objective standpoint, to fathom, what natural feelings and ideas are for themselves. We know how only Göthe correctly stated, that a legitimate Subject is a *somewhat*, what corresponds to legitimate in an Object is a *something*. The uniformity is therefore the one

collective and the entirety of the newer philosophy, both the idealistic and the materialistic, has set itself the task of understanding this sole unit of legitimate being, coming from whatever different means.

There is no absolute Subject and no absolute Object, and also no absolutely subjective, hypothetical and deductive, in contrast to one absolutely inductive method given to objective observing. In establishing the regularity of appearances, it can therefore always only be a matter of more or less from both methods. This balance applies pressure aiding the development of the methods. The natural method is predominantly of an inductive character, which gives enormous success. In sociology however, the one method most advanced until now has been the hypothetical, the deductive. There is complete confusion caused by this in sociological terms, where no social laws are discovered. For what some economist, statistician, ethnographer, historian and also sociologist issue as social laws, can only be traced back via a chance causal connection concerning individual relations between persons or events. That under certain circumstances the coincidence of the increase in bread prices with the rate of increase in suicides and crimes collapses, such an accidental factor occurring in a large number of parallel rises, is not yet a necessary law. The regularity is even less in sociological terms of average numbers of amounts, emerging from a long series of data and figures. All so-called laws set up after the statistical method, belong to this category. The same applies to the historical method. One also likes to investigate exactly the causal connection between an entire sequence of events and relations, but such a procedure cannot lead to the establishing of a law because the connection is still only determined by coincidence. This also moved Treitschke to admit before his death that he was unable to perceive any order in history. The statistical and historical methods have been, moreover, completely developed without discovering any regular connection between social events, and any original fixed event that is derived from nature. Human society and Nature are fixed as two entirely different spheres of existence, that meet one another, at most, only at some external point of contact. —

The followers of the organic method in sociological areas, or the Organicer, as they are now called by some sociologists, have now set themselves the task of discovering the connection between the product of nature and the social sciences, to prove the universal order of nature and human society. From an explanation of the simple, the many aspects of science become complex, and the organicist had to attempt to construct a scientific system based upon firm reasoning, beginning with the fundamental areas of biology and positive psychology. The foundations of physiology, based upon chemistry, are constructed upon the basis of mechanics, which delivers the biology and the positive psychology, forming the foundations for the construction of sociology. The inductive method should provide a clue to the comparison between the social and the natural organism. The famous physiologist Johannes Müller posed the following statement :

Psychologus nemo nisi Physiologus. The organicist translates this statement thus : Sociologus nemo, nisi biologus. [My guess — You cannot have psychology without physiology. & There is no sociology without biology.]

The organicist acknowledges the existence of the authority derived from the statistical, historic, and the purely deductive methods, but sees all of these methods as only auxiliary to the areas sociology concentrates on. Sociology requires the organic method to investigate the order of social phenomenon, and serves, for its part, as an auxiliary science to the cultural and philosophical accounts. A mutually beneficial arrangement emerges, but this is only possible if each science adheres to its own special area of expertise by applying those methods developed accordingly, and does not transgress upon unfamiliar areas where to do so would only cause confusion. The sociologist required the historic method, and so became the cultural historian, required the statistical method, and so became an economist, and when immersing themselves into general theories derived from hypothetical accounts, this is metaphysics.

With all these distinctions however, the researcher focuses on the sociological, but loses the sociology itself to each discrete authority. It is due to the anti-organicist therefore that sociology

owes the challenge to its scientific character, so that it is looked upon as a barren area of general investigation, drawn from the ideas, concepts and research results of other specialists. Only the use of the organic method can raise sociology to the level of an independent science. Only by a firm connection with natural entities, can it achieve the objective of each specialist subject : the establishment of the order of reality.

We now seek, firstly, to determine the point of demarcation through which the connection between that which is supposed to be the sociological domain, and the natural entity, may be found. —

Professor Max Verworn defined, in his pioneering work : *General Physiology*, the biological concept of the individual in the following manner :

“An organic individual is a uniform mass of living substance, which, under certain external life conditions, is capable of displaying a uniform orientation.”

[The original text says : “*An organic individual is a unitary mass of living substance which under definite external vital conditions is capable of self-preservation.*”

(Verworn p. 58, Trans. by Lee, 1899.)]

This definition of M. Verworn turns first of all upon all single free living organisms, in the form in which they appear in nature. “However”, it adds, “the definition applies to more than organisms that are only spatially related ; it comprises allied groups of single organisms, each one of which certainly can be spatially separated, but nonetheless all together form a unit.” As an example of this the main author on the life of ants, shows the undivided form indicates how members of an organism uniformly cooperate. The entire distinction between a coral cane and an ant pile, after Verworn, consists only in that the individuals of a low order are bound by a substantial degree, in contrast to the spatial separation by which they are separated in an ant society.

[The above quote from Verworn in Lee’s trans. : “But it includes more than single organisms ; it includes groups of organisms, each one of which is separated from the others by space, but which together form a unit.” (Ibid.)

These two samples of professional translation indicate where my machine made effort may be lacking. These additions inserted, Monday, 16 November 2009.]

The in depth view of all scientists will doubtless agree with this definition of the individual, and the connection between sociology and biology is also found here.

The individual ant society consists of cellular elements, that can already be designated as persons. But it represents forever a collective group being, that is fixed at a very low developmental stage, and seemingly to be so for all time. The persons forming the ant society are fixed by certain instinctively determined standards.

Which organic developments come to fruition with the next animal form ? — The societies formed by persons, owe their superiority over the animal form to a capacity for gradual progressive development. Physiological necessity creating the cell in the single organism, has instinct stamped upon it in the animal society, and has raised itself more recently in human society causing the persons forming society to become self aware. As between a person and an animal there exists only a gradual distinction, we can see also that between a human and an animal society, there is only a graduated difference. It is now proven that the animal society represents an individual, and the individual society must also be an individual, or, what amounts to the same thing when understood as a real organism. — Whether the single societies will unite themselves into a yet superior whole organism, that will contain all humanity, is for the future to reveal. In the present cultural stage, the nation is the highest unit of cooperative potential between individuals.

Everything we say in respect to the state in our discussions, applies to less rigid social associations in just as real, if also more restricted senses.

Max Verworn, along with several other scientists, distinguishes in the organism's form, five different orders of personality : these consist of the cells as elementary organisms ; the tissues that are composed of the cells ; the organs that are formed by the tissues ; the persons who represent a union of organs ; and finally the societies, arising from the association of persons. Each higher order of individual incorporates at the same time all lower orders within itself to form a hierarchy. Therefore the person's location is formed within one society, there is no simple arrangement side by side, otherwise individuals would become the trees of a forest, the blades of a field, accidentally merging the animals of the herd, so that no higher personality, no organism could form. Uniform cooperation is realised in society as the individual dedicates and subordinates their actions to collective purposes. Such harmonisation can only be produced through the hierarchical potential of the different elements of which society is composed being placed above one another to bring society into being. In ant and bee society, this occurs in the grouping and differentiating of the social builders above one another into elements working, not working, or only engaging in special work, expressed as ruling and serving classes. In bee society, harmonisation is achieved through a central individual, as demonstrated by the queen bee, held in supreme regard. In human society, individuals are similarly united first of all in simpler associations, like family, and clan. These grow together into complex developments, as tribes, peoples, and different economic partnerships. Finally out of this, the higher classes, ruling in a similar manner by means of individuals develop into a central organ which represents society. In human society therefore the same hierarchical system, through which the lower orders of the organism's personality are produced, repeats itself : the individual corresponds to the cells, the simpler social associations are the tissues, the complex are the organs, and the social forces accrue to the central organ. In individuals of the vegetable and animal kingdom, direct contact between cells forming tissues and organs is only apparent. No absolutely impenetrable bodies exist in nature, therefore there is no direct combination of elements even in the hardest of bodies. In this respect there can only be a matter of more or less space. Gaseous bodies consist of molecules distanced from one another to a greater degree than applies in the formation of fluid substances ; and in their turn these are formed from molecules that are more distant from one another than those of firm bodies, but in all cases there is always only a body.

In just the same way that each society locates individuals as we find in bee and ant society, so we find an individual in a society of cells, although the spatial ratios in which the state of harmony arises are very different. In the individual organism, the differentiated cell is probably tied more firmly to certain tissues and organs, than the individual in society. A cell cannot wander from the skeleton into the muscle tissue or into the nervous system, its distinction is specific, and strictly defined. In individuals however it also provides the cell walls of the red blood corpuscles, the leukocytes, and the spermatozoa. Most kinds of cell walls define individuals that form one society, but they are also at the same time psychologically more or less different cells, and therefore also the cells of certain families, classes and orders of the social bond. In the contained and slave state, this association is firmer, in a free state it is looser. It gives absolute freedom however in the one, just like in the other, to few.

Distinctions are caused between different orders of personality therefore, not determined according to form, by space time ratios, but rather by inequalities between energy potentials. Cooperation between cells in individual organisms is determined solely by mechanical, chemical and physiological forces ; in animal society these forces are known as instincts ; in human society the potential of instinct itself gradually develops into a semiconscious state and finally an awareness of living together, leading to a joining together of parts, to think and to want as one.

Every human person, wants apart from their purely physical body, another being of the ancient person stored in the social life, an inheritance of the ancestors capital of psycho-physiological energy joining the social parts together and enabling them to be an equal with the

ancestor. This capital is already fixed as an inheritance to the same purely physical units, and therefore to each person by their descent through a certain family, race, or nation. The inherited psycho-physiological capital is however at the same time derived from an earlier generation making discrepancies between the accumulated capital of social life, regarding certain intellectual, ethical, aesthetic units, capacities and developmental stages. Through upbringing the cultural capital is further developed and varied, but even so each upbringing always only has available to it material from latent psychic forces. A domestic animal can only be raised to a very low degree of intelligence and thus raised, can only offer a very narrow circle of performance ; likewise the representative of a low race. Therefore in addition each individual is not tied solely by its descent to certain associations, but rather it is also subject to the influence of inherited cultural values, expressed by the way its upbringing and performance is directed in society. Through descent, transmission and upbringing, contingent on one another as the basis of each society, as well as the cultural forms.

On the highest level of culture, the psychic, is found however, next to the higher, also the lower : the mechanical, chemical, physiological, instinctive forces that are effective both in society, and in the life of the individual. As an inhabitant of the earth the person will never be able to free himself of his origin, derived out of inorganic material and organic matter. He will always have to provide his physical needs through material means of satisfaction. An inevitable increase in performance will occur, after the standard of cultural development, impacting upon the environment (machines, transport, culinary art etc.) but the end of more mechanical, chemical and physiological personal work, and that of material cultural value, will not come. The highly developed civilisation will also always be dependant upon material means for its existence and development. —

The dependence of the person upon material matter is not manifested in the satisfaction of physical needs, but rather in the development of the intellectual attributes and abilities. The capitalising and realisation of psychic energies is always accompanied by mechanical, chemical, and physiological processes in the individual's nervous system, whose molecular components are changed and remodelled at the same time. New tissues and organs, from the lower to the higher, form themselves in a progressive development ; the higher atrophy themselves to the lower in a regressive movement. With the entire progress of humanity following along these lines, the higher nervous organs are centred in the brain and the individual's concentration gradually instructs itself from generation to generation by gradually growing into a higher memory derived from latent psychic energies accumulated from the passage of descent. These higher nerve organs, the material carriers of the intellectual, ethical and aesthetic elements and capacities of the human individual, are a product of society and give society its form, they are the living source of feedback for each individual cooperating in the making of society.

We now seek to provide ourselves with a more detailed account, by what ways and means the accumulation and realisation of the psychic forces come to form the pinnacle of the social effort.

Apart from the actual womb, the necessary bodily care in earliest childhood and of some purely conventional uses, like handshake, kiss, etc., a cultured person can spend decades in society, without coming into physical contact with his equal, only to find himself accidentally in the same place. And nevertheless this exhibits a more definite and lively interaction than with other members of society. The interaction of the will expressed in this workplace can be summarised mainly under three categories : word, writing, art work, the latter in its most comprehensive meaning. Through the expression of language and art, like for instance music, mediated by the excited oscillation of the air molecules to the hearing nerves ; by the character and product of the plastic arts : excitement mediated to our sense of sight via the oscillation of the ether in response to monument, statue, or painting. Regarding our higher external senses : the physical medium surrounding us effects a certain attraction upon the ear and the eye. In biology the concept of the

attraction is more extensive. Each effect of an external factor upon an organism can certainly be considered as something sensed as an attraction.

However wherein does the effect of attraction now exist ?

Each living substance possesses the capacity to react against external attractions whereby a transformation and an interference in the molecular and dynamic balance of its internally established components would take priority. Also the excitements produced by word, writing, artwork and achievements of our external senses evoke such an effect of attraction in our higher internal nerve organs. A later reaction on their part occurs against the external attractions in that they release the latent energies accumulated in them and transfer their molecular components.

There does not however exist in inorganic nature or the organism's world, any fixed ratio between the quality and intensity of the attraction and the attractive effect. A soft mechanical push can produce an enormous chemical effect, as we find for instance in all explosive materials and in exactly the opposite manner where strong external stimulants of the attractive effect are resisted, as in the approach of a magnet to a piece of wood etc.

In the psycho-physiological interaction between people in society the disproportion between the attractive force and the attractive effect becomes even more sharply pronounced. If a crowd gathered in a closed room hears the word fire!, it forces itself into masses at the exists, where a fight for life and death emerges. The fright paralyses the people as one and freezes the blood in the veins, as an effort to act through screams and raging results from the exceptional muscle power it produces. The word fire! only, has produced an effect on this meeting as large as an ignited match on a powder magazine, through whose explosion an entire city's population might be destroyed. There sufficed an easy contraction of the neck muscles and the tongue to produce here a soft movement resulting in the grip of these effects. When all the areas of the world through telegrams and newspapers receive messages describing a war between two great powers the mind of numerous populations are sent into a state of excitement ; trade comes to a standstill, a vigorous deployment of military measures is activated and so on, and such only in consequence of a momentary oscillation of the ether impinging upon the sense of sight. Such an effect of attraction can only be explained by the magnificent capital of psycho-physical energies, that are stored in each individual and in each society as a collective individual. Triggering such latent psycho-physical energies can cause a reduction of the capital, but also an enlargement of the same as a consequence of a simultaneous or ensuing transformation of the molecules in the higher nerve centres. I read a well constructed book, a clearly reasoned philosophical work, I listen to a pretty melody, I observe a work of art harmoniously carried out, and the experience is accompanied by the effect of attraction due to the triggering of psycho-physical energies, but with the simultaneous sequence of events causing the dynamically enriched reshaping of my higher nerve centres I myself become affected and feel uplifted. An opposite result would be delivered by the lesson of immoral literature, a confused philosophical system, hearing discordant music, or observing a tasteless work of art.

If we imagine however that the way the word fire is to be conceived, or how the message of war expressed in language, cannot be understood by anyone, then the effect of attraction falls away completely. A speech that no one listens to, a manuscript or a book that no one reads, an art exhibition without things, a painting that no one regarded, would therefore be as a stimulant only dead matter, their achievements pointless, it is then that one brings useful power in the practice of production into the effort.

From the preceding it follows that a culture exists only to the extent that it actually has an essential value, as when the human individual, who, as a living element forms all social tissues, organs and the society through which culture develops intellectually, is aesthetically uplifted, morally invigorated, and becomes physically healthier.

Through one unlimited internal process with its accumulation of material wealth, only the long term cultural purposes are important, there not being attained is nominally represented by the

irregular and disorderly distribution between the individuals and classes of society. In our *Social Pathology** we established more exactly and explained in more detail, that the circulation of social wealth could be divided into positive, negative and neutral categories of utility. We assert that our standpoint completely accords with the basis of Christianity, which mainly applies itself to the task of improving the personality, and it is worthless to seek to explain the difference between our account and the heart of the belief in the sacrament**.

In places a comparison exists between the interaction of individuals in the social organism and the processes through which our body is animated, first of all there is the interaction of the cells in the nervous system and especially in the higher organs of the same, that is itself analogous to the material carriers of individual feeling, thinking and desire. The nerve cells also mutually excite themselves through attraction, mutually differentiating and stimulating themselves relative to specific tissues and organs, accumulating psycho-physical energies and at the same time releasing that which had already been accumulated previously. Each cell of the individual nervous system has itself gradually, biogenetically, through an immense sequence of cellular partnerships always itself been mutually differentiated and stimulated, through conformity to the internal, organic medium, through a fight for its existence, selection and transmission, in response to a steady mutual effect of attraction, to which it is raised by functional forces and the histological developments of specific nervous tissue and organs to which it belongs. So also the primitive human develops with the division of the real undivided whole, whereby the cellular elements of the social system are always being remodelled, according to the same historical manner, by way of an immense sequence of increasingly united feeling, thinking, and desiring generations of cultured peoples.

The excitement evoked between the cells, tissues and organs of the body by the attraction between the nerves is designated in biology and psychology as a reflection. According to their position each person in the social association living together causes the effect of a steady state of reflection to exist. In psychology it is the automatically occurring effects of attraction between the individual nerves of the system which are probably first understood under the term reflection, before the self generative effects of attraction. But between the automatic, semiconscious and conscious effects a greater fluency is distinguished. Therefore by the newer psychologists, the concept of reflection has been extended to each interaction between the tissues and organs due to the effect of attraction between the nerves. But association in the social organism, in consequence of the greater mobility and autonomy of the single cell elements, while subject to the direct reflection mediated through the individual nervous system by a nervous connection, is yet subject to indirect, mediated reflections, through writing, art work etc. It follows that the effects of indirect reflection according to its nature are identical with the direct, irrespective of above considerations, because they are clearly transferred mutually between one another, without the effect acquiring any variation. News of the death of a relative or a friend causes an equal disturbance, whether it arrives directly, orally, from person to person or mediated by a letter or telegram, so that it is received through indirect reflection. And the energy change of the ganglion cells of our brain, the state of the cells at first being normal for the social organism, likewise indicates an internalising mode, marking the transition process from direct to indirect reflection. It was recently observed, the joining between the dendrite (branching of the ganglion cells) of the ganglion cells with the nerve fibres (sending) of one another on which they exercised an attraction, was not substantial, but rather that between them another intervening object is located. The energy change between ganglion cells does not quite occur therefore in this case, although there is a direct exchange of substance, but rather there is only a contact between dendrite and nerve fibres through the avoidance of the

*) *Social Pathology*, Book II of the *International Library of Sociology*.

**) See our *Thoughts Concerning the Social Science of the Future*, Book V : *Attempt at a Natural Theology*, p. 65 and ff.

intervening objects.

For a complete so-called reflective action, a central interconnection must exist between the interacting elements of perception and attraction. The reflective action in its totality appears in society, if we consider for instance an attraction to the central agencies, that deliver government, and that reaction follows from that through different measures, commands etc. The attractions retain single affiliates but also retain character by reflection in the interaction of the social groups with one another, in that it is also with them that the most important events in the processes take place : receiving of an attraction through sensual perception, reaction against that realised through psycho-physical energies, development of new molecular orders, fixing of new dynamic elements. — Around designations and words much argument centres. Of great importance for sociology however would be the determination and acceptance of a terminology, that would already indicate according to its wording the connection between sociology and general biology, as well as positive psychology. We made an attempt at such a terminology in our preceding works. A science that controls no certain terminology can never create for itself a definitive structure and will also never be acknowledged as an independent science. Each researcher that becomes established on the basis of subjective views, contributes to the treasury of words forming the deposit constituting the zone to be investigated, giving rise to endless word disputes. Also, a classification corresponding to the nature, the objects, the research and the subjects, is not possible without a firm terminology. Each researcher also creates a new classification with its own treasury of words contributing to the scientific depository. In all branches the natural entity is defined by its connection with the terminology of the forms to be investigated, and the relationship between the adjacent areas of knowledge to which we have referred. We believe this rule is justified in that we designated the interaction of the individual in social life as a reflection effect.

For the same reason, we also designated the social organism as a nervous system. Between the words 'system' and the 'body' in biology there is no distinction to be made. Our body's form consists of different systems of cells, tissues and organs, the skeleton, muscle, the motor vascular, the nervous system, and in everyone the body is the same. The word *system* could be preferred to the label *social organism* to this extent, when it refers to the looser mechanical connection of the single elements relative to one another. So the planetary bodies that circle around the sun form likewise a system. The distinction we find is however, as already indicated above, one of degree, and not one of any essential difference. Our sun's system would become to an observer, located in the reaches of the Milky Way, possessed of more possible variations as to how these systems appear, than a single gaseous or illuminating body.

We have the social nervous system, in analogy to that in the body of available but not yet assimilated nutritious materials and protective devices, and the substances already eliminated by the cells, tissues and organs, set against the intercellular social substance. In a further sense to this, all useful goods belong : ground, waters, the atmosphere, generally the physical medium in which the single elements of the social organism are imbedded and move. In the narrower sense of the intercellular social substance, all valuables circulating in society, that are consumed by the individual in the act of satisfying its needs, immediately constitute in themselves the circulating sap in which, in animals, alike with plants, the nourishment is assimilated.

The opponents of the organic method always confuse the intercellular substance, that includes only lifeless substances, therefore matter, in itself, with the living elements of the social organism, that only come to be represented because of persons and out of which the social nervous system is formed. Therefore the anti-organicist sets down a completely confused picture of the social organism, and extracts from the confusion the views characteristic of their refutation. They maintain namely, that, for the organicist the characteristics of the social organism means that telegraph wires should be identified with the nerves, and railroad stations just as much with the heart. Telegraph wires, the railroads with all their structural framework are incorporated material, they exist only as utilities serving different purposes in the social nervous system, where they form,

however inadequately, a living substance. Orchestrating the intercellular social substance itself, and the stimulus to action in the individual and the society, which applies equally to the plant and the animal, the need for subsistence subjects people to commands and restraints first mechanically, both morphological and physiological, before they consume or assimilate the same. So that each accumulation of capital from the valuables is always rendered inert, until the energy contained therein is assimilated by persons. The inert capital, as a portion of the intercellular substance, only represents an extension of the psycho-physiological energies accumulated in persons. The refutations of the anti-organicist are therefore to be looked at in this regard, only as ripples in the water.

Each realisation of mechanical, chemical and psycho-physiological energies indicates a prior superior memory of the same. We saw, concerning the magnificent resource of latent psychic energies possessed by each person, that this is however especially true of the cultured person. By what process, was this capital resource accumulated ?

Primitive humans controlled only a semi-articulated expression of thoughts and feelings ; they made use of traditional elements in order to indicate the will through external signs ; they knew only the first numbers and reckoned with the digits of the hands and feet ; their weapons were crude stones and wooden clubs ; the art of sound existed only in a desolate noise making, the art of dance in a jumping and going to the beat ; serving almost exclusively only to satisfy the most urgent physical needs. But it was already implicit at that time that these original reflection effects were a stimulus to social action, through which the members of primitive society were gradually encouraged to higher thinking, feeling and desires ; already at that time reason was applied to the development of nervous organs, from which the later cultural capacity of the person developed itself. Each generation of the upwardly striving elements of the primitive populations that achieved one step forwards towards the more intensive reflection effect, bequeathed the increased cultural capacity in the form of more highly developed nerve agencies in the next branch of their descendants. Accordingly not only more and more through new hierarchies of latent psycho-physical energies, did those energies that one can designate as social, grow because they were a product of the social life, but rather, they developed in each preceding generation, around the new hierarchy's time and space. On this gradual process of hierarchical development and the condensation of higher agencies, that are preferably united in the human brain, the law of ever more concentrated replication in the individual, of the entire cultural account of humanity rests. This law, that we indicated as the central socio-embryological law, itself corresponds completely with the general embryological law, which is known to apply throughout the entire world of organisms. The psycho-physiological developmental properties of every single human individual therefore puts into the hand of the cultural historian the thread required in order to investigate the entire story of humanity. The socio-embryological law of development would have to serve as a base for each cultural account. But it stands in the boundary zone between biology and the political sciences in its present stage of development. Therefore this constitutional law of sociology is almost completely surveyed. The biologists are not sociologists and the economists, lawyers and politicians are not biologists. Only a few outstanding intellects in Germany, including Roscher, Hellwald, and Schäffle have proclaimed this law according to its full scientific value.

The child of today, in accordance with the socio-embryological law just presented in its real form, through which the building of its brain proceeded, represents the developmental stage upon which humanity was located in its earliest youth. The higher social nerve agencies are so far advanced in their development that the child of today in the first years of its life already controls, in an organism as yet incompletely developed physically, the intellectual and ethical energy that was only attained in the primitive human in full maturity.

The child interprets external impressions unconsciously or semiconsciously ; it does not tend to try and imitate ; it is detached from the causes external attractions are having upon it. To

the ears and eyes of the child, outgoing reflections spread themselves at once over the entire nervous system, and set almost all muscles of the body in motion. The child is not in control of herself in the immediate situation ; she gives herself away at once, entirely and completely, to the first great impression. Brightly illuminating bodies, harsh colours, loudly blaring sounds especially captivate its attention. Involuntary movement and unrestrained perceptions, i.e. the passions are much stronger in the child than in the adult, at the same time however they are much more fleeting in that the child is subject to a more direct influence, arising from changing external impressions and appearances. The human brain is an apparatus that processes the reflections coming from without and fixes them. With extended training of this apparatus, the person no longer gives himself away involuntarily and immediately to the external impression, the irresolute perception, the blind impulse. It acts according to the standard of its social development and is always more subjectively aware and more objectively independent.

We look at ourselves in the wild state, and we find that the domain over which the psychic energies preside, are homogenous with those of most children. Therefore today the will's position in regard to the education of its social nerve organs, is perhaps only a few steps higher than in the primitive human. The wild descendants that yet continue to exist today therefore represent remaining branches of a collective tribe's social development, from which the cultured human has come into being following an upward trend through a series of higher stages. The intermediate stages are represented through the living descendants that correspond to the mythological and heroic ages of history. These historical epochs correspond to the youthful essence of the modern cultured human. Therefore three sequences of psychological events stand before us : the psychophysiological development of the individual in the form of the modern cultured human, from the child to maturity ; the historical mechanism operating from the primitive to the cultured person, the progressive psychological evolution as designated through the wild, semi-wild and barbarous tribes ; and finally the development of society into a complex social system. On these three levels, the individual, historical and social, one and the same uninterrupted developmental process indicates the law of threefold parallelism is in agreement, and this in itself establishes the next, the adjacent and the ascendant to one another of social becoming, that corresponds to the general laws of threefold parallelism that are valid throughout the entire organic world of ontogenetic, phyletic and systematic development. To which specific stimulus to action this general law leads, the formations in the economic (physiological), judicial (morphological) and hierarchical-political (unifying) spheres of the social life, and through which variation it is stipulated, we explained in our earlier works *.

The entirety of mankind represents a tree, whose roots, composed of the primitive human tribe, jut into the animal world, that, after spreading apart in all directions, with branches ascending upwards to differing heights, came to be represented today by descendants of races standing upon different cultural platforms. The leaves of this gigantic tree are not the individuals ; but the individuals have, like the leaves of a plant, held themselves in isolation from one another, only relating themselves by descent from the general tribe to which they are attached, but rather, individuals alive now, belong to different branches diverted from one another in earlier periods of history, but in the past there must always of been moments and points in time at which they simultaneously converged as a collective main trunk, or in the original tribe. On this unity of descent the concern of all people for the partnership of physical and psychic reason rests. If the single branches and leaves simply flowed out of one another, they would of differentiated into just

* *Thoughts Concerning the Social Science of the Future* : Bk. I *The Human Society as Real Organism* ; Bk. II *The Social Laws* ; Bk. III *The Social Psychophysic* ; Bk. IV *The Social Physiology* ; Bk. V *Attempt at a Natural Theology*.

means of integration of one kind or another, always conveying their ongoing development. Leading to such single species and orders as we see illustrated in plants and in the animal world. However the single human individual was always united through the mutual reflection effect, into new tissues, organs and units, and in this way, independent of its descent, was raised to higher differentiating developmental platforms. Living humanity is so differentiated by languages, that the position regarding the connection through descent only, is removed, and so they must be understood as a product of the purely social life. Only in the lower races are the physical features prominent, like skin colour, hair growth etc., as a differentiating factor. But also the individual, descendants and races are only related in the social life before the fight for progress in the prehistoric millennia and the historical periods, and are only advanced under the steady influence in conformity to the external physical, and the internal social medium, through selection and transmission. I have tried to represent graphically how this entire process, in agreement with the general world law causes the next, adjacent and ascendant to one another, of all coming into being in time, space and in the imprint of power, in my study published in French : *La method graphique en Sociologie*. *

Finally it can be emphasised again that all social processes are not of that simply psychic, superior kind, they like to reach, but rather simultaneously they are also physical and the person in no matter what higher stage of development cannot deny the lower stages, therefore descent from the inorganic to the organic cannot be entirely denied. On just this indissoluble connection between the higher and the lower in the individual and in the social life, the establishment of social regularity in agreement with the laws of the organic world relies. Sociology is directed in its researches exactly as in positive psychology and biology, as the latter are in physiology and chemistry. The sociologist that denies biology, will always construct only air locks to fathom, instead of firm laws. —

However the sociologist who does not assert that the connection between sociology and biology should be denied, may establish their sociological views on the opposite of this connection, but nonetheless obtain a position only half way toward this direction. To these sociologists Spencer, with his entire supplement, also belongs. Spencer does not interpret society as a concrete individual, but rather as a discrete collection like the trees of a forest, the blades of a field, the accidentally converged animals of a herd. Therefore through this partial view of social life Spencer also arrived at entirely one-sided conclusions, ending in the misjudgement of social appearances. He surveyed almost the entirety of social life's unifying factors, and considered only the autonomy of the individual. In his final works, as for instance concerning "justice", the firm biological ground has even been entirely discarded, and makes use of the hypothetical method in sociological subjects. —

Some sociologists appear as an opponent of the organic method due to a sequence of misunderstandings of the view taken of this method, of its limits and the purposes of its use. Recently, a short work by Professor Ludwig Stein appeared, dedicated to the criticism of the organic method in sociology.** For the most part we agree unanimously with the propositions, according to the nature of this outstanding thinker. He himself cannot speak of anything as separate, and declares that social life in its entire circumference is mechanical (p. 15.). It must not be thought that when followed in reverse, this is completely correct when all things are considered, and that even the most biological and physiological appearances result from the effect of purely mechanical factors. But one does not forget at the same time, that each higher sphere of appearances always embraces within itself all lower necessities. So it is that the social organism comes into being, and is formed out of, mechanical, chemical, physiological, psychological

* In volumes III and IV of the *Annals of the International Institute of Sociology*.

** Ludwig Stein : *The Nature and Task of Sociology*.

and social energies, and elements. There are therefore also mechanical necessities in social life. Upon the attainment of the highest cultural level the person must still do mechanical work, even if to a slightly lesser degree than in earlier phases. In other words, it will also be so for all time, irrespective of whatever form society may take, there will always be classes that will have to perform mechanical work in spite of all conceivable perfection of machines that might come into being. All modes of movement through space, in whatever way they are overcome, will, for all time, only be mechanical. On chemical and physiological necessities the person is already dependant, therefore he always will be as he will never be able to dispose of his own physical organism and the indissoluble material needs connected with it. The individual brings with them, into the social life, all these necessities, and she is always forced to adapt to this same condition. There also follows however, the precise observation that society itself is a personality, a real organism that therefore cannot develop any differently than by acting in accordance with generally valid biological laws, that are also based upon biological necessities, and social necessities that rest upon them. Like all natural organisms it is physiological, morphological and must uniformly actuate itself, as well as each social association, economical, judicial and hierarchical-political. The amount of work, the concurrence, the ratio between demand and supply, the population law of Malthus, the law of land values of Ricardo, the embryological law assessed by us, are all based upon biological necessities. No individual, no society, can withdraw itself from them. Exactly as the psycho-physical reflection effect between individuals is based upon social tissues and organs, that realisation and higher memory of the nerve energies in the social nervous system, that projection of the individual and the social psycho-physiological energies into the surrounding physical medium, that capitalising of the valuables, is based likewise upon necessary psychological laws, that can for their part be traced back to the interaction of the cells within the individual nervous system. Finally, social life is subject to the general law of agreement to the next, adjacent to, and ascendant to one another, in time, space and power. Therefore at its peak, each society records within itself its development, even at the pinnacle of culture all the lower elements and energies remain within, in every history, and even the associations of today, standing next to each other, do so upon the lowest developmental platform that still exists.

Hr. L. Stein says that the principle necessity that appears to predominate in social life, is that of expediency. We have never denied the predominant value of the principle of expediency in society. However we always represented both principles as a reflection of realities, being united in our representation, in which no absolutely unilateral bias asserts itself, but rather where both always act simultaneously, only in different ratios. The construction of endlessly increasing increments is stipulated in the succession from the simple to the multifaceted, by the connection of this principle from the inorganic foundation to the animal, human and social life in unequal ratios. We have even tried to express these increasing increments by means of a mathematical formula whose first extension consists of an endlessly large material measure, next to one endlessly smaller that is nominal, and the last extension as yet unknown to us, must consist of one endlessly small material measure, in addition to one nominal that is endlessly larger. The average units of this formula gradually divide into one another, with the reduction of the measure and the increase of the denominators.* The social life of the person now appears different according to this increment, the level of development already attained, reaches the cultural platform without reaching the absolutely highest step, on which the rate dwindles as a measure of necessity, to zero. This step belongs to the divinity, to the absolutely free being.

Now however the addition of science is especially called for, to fathom the causal connections that necessarily exist between the forms observed. Each should rely on the ability of the other. The concept of expediency therefore belongs to the zone of art, in the most

*) *Thoughts Concerning the Social Science of the Future*, Bk. II, p. 48.

comprehensive sense of the word. In that science possesses the ability to fathom the necessary laws of existence, it delivers the possibility of grasping certain purposes. Therein the task of sociology also exists, when the science of society should have the same ability. Social craftsmanship arises out of the principle of expediency, just as the practical technical sciences pursue economic purposes, having for example industrial capability as their objective. But as with the latter results derived from the natural object, both must be self supporting, and must be grasped by the social craftsman in the act of conducting sociological investigations.

Throwing the zones of science and art together within the sociological forum, has thus far only caused confusion, and given occasion for endless disputes over words.

The Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount should contain the same meaning for each Christian. But how can this requirement be realised in social life ? In addition, the necessities through which each society's life is defined, must be recognised. The statesman will see that his priority, immediately after assessing and establishing these necessities, is to obtain the position realised by the Christian.

L. Stein says when considering the search for necessary laws, that only laws of nature are universally valid. (p. 15.) He doubts that it is possible that sociology could ever succeed in fathoming such laws. Social necessities have already been assessed, the reckoning already conducted, could such a doubt be lifted. But this author bases the natural regularity of one event upon the regularity of another event side by side, that of statistical numbers, on certain periodicities of social events, relying upon self-repeating rhythms in social development. Personalities rely solely upon a certain sequence of events and the conditions concerning their causal connections, as they are traced back however, they form the object of history and this is especially so of the culture, and the philosophy of history. Sociology would investigate the same causal connections, but its zone within the discipline would collapse and the account of Paul Barth would be completely correct in equating its "philosophy of history as sociology" with sociology and the history of philosophy. The justification for the existence of sociology as an independent science establishes itself on just this point, that it has the investigation of the necessary laws of social events as its object. This can however only be realised by use of the organic method. The presence of sociology as an independent science stands or falls with this method, because it is the only method that has, as a postulate of human society, recognised it as an individual living being, coalesced as a real organism. —

The boundary which has to define the form sociology takes, is prescribed by biology. The biologists for their part are also forced to restrict themselves to the investigation of general laws. Explanation on the basis of the causal connections between single events and events in general, must be renounced. We can imagine the case of an eagle of unusual size with a powerful beak and enormous claws, being born in the Corsican mountains. No biologist would adopt a position based on the convolutions of the factors that would of cooperated at one and the same time to explain such an event. This eagle flies to France, to Egypt, Italy, Germany and then Russia and causes enormous desolation in the bird world, and this could also not be explained by a biologist on the basis of the general laws investigated by them. Just as few will be able to deliver to sociology an explanation whereby Napoleon being born on the island of Corsica, selected his eagle-flight according to a preference hither and whither, and so on. And this is valid in regard to the appearance of all unusual personalities and events where chance is a major factor. Chance however often plays a decisive role in history. The description of the incidents relating to such personalities and events provides the account informing the sciences, that is then looked at therefore unwisely, as an art. Also every accidental event comes to be evoked by certain causes, by a will like that of each individual determined by external influences and internal motives. The convolutions and

complications of the causal factors operating at the same time is so great however, that they can be scientifically investigated only in the most exceptional, and in a very restricted, sense. With regard to social events, it is pragmatic historical research that has to solve this task. The summarizing of events and conditions under more general viewpoints belongs to cultural history and the history of philosophy. Sociology on the other hand is directed according to the only free zone, toward establishing the necessary natural laws of social events. She exceeds the boundary of this zone, expanding herself into a universal social science, with the bias to include all remaining social disciplines within : economic, jurisprudence, politics, linguistics, religion, ethics, aesthetics, anthropology, ethnography, history etc. Instead of performing something positive by means of this expansion, sociology only becomes the collective playground for accidental and loosely ordered excursions out of the adjoining zones. Exactly the same applies therefore to the economist, or jurist. Designate the specialised researches of the anthropologist, ethnographer and historian as sociological, and they are restricted in that their presentations simply become expressions : to add to evolution, social progress, regulation, process etc. At the same time however, these academics are the outspoken opponents of the organic method in sociology, because just that zone which must serve as the basis of sociology, namely biology, is almost completely unknown to them and consequently their entire view of the nature of social events is not scientific, but rather either pragmatic or hypothetical. —

What further increases the confusion now ruling in the field of sociology, is that which was introduced by Auguste Comte, and adopted by Spencer and his school and carried further by most of the American sociologist, that is the arrangement of sociology into statics and dynamics.

There can only be statics in physics, because only here are mechanical forces producing balanced end products with fixed properties, subject to investigation accordingly. The organic world represents a steady transforming and remodelling of forces and formations. A balanced and stable condition with regard to living beings can only be considered in relation to those moments that can be identified as those through which the transitions from one state of being into another form occur. However conditions are always subject to that which the researcher's eye happens to light upon, and the particles of the fluent current found thereby. For the biologist therefore, and all the more so for the sociologist, there can only be dynamics. Those forms which are indicative of the sociological under the category of static, namely the existing institutions, correct proportions etc., determine the internal and external building of a society, and therefore belong to the sphere of social morphology. However the latter also conforms to the dynamic nature because forms and proportions change irresistibly. They are located proximately with the living factors, conjointly forming a steady stream. Biology therefore also knows only a morphology and no statics. This concept, with the evasion of biology, is falsely transferred from mechanics directly into sociology, and has thereby sown the seed establishing a disastrous state of confusion in the sociological zone.

Before we go any further we want to look at just one more thing, to throw light on the use sociology will make of the organic method in relation to history. The philosophy of history can only take its proper form after a philosophically handled history, and what we claim to be so of this relationship therefore applies to all such relationships, and so too of the history of philosophy. —

The first task above all for positive sociology, is to produce for itself a framework for history, into which the social events from all spheres must go : the economic, judicial, political, and likewise the religious, ethical, and aesthetic, before they come into being, must conform to the same framework, which social life cannot exceed under any conditions or proportions, and in which all historical events, and events composed of single moments, are made to conform to one and the same force of evolution.

How this framework should form itself, is determined by that which sociology has already assessed, and those necessary laws yet to be assessed that determine how social events occur. First of all however, the acquisitions of sociology will not fail to give credit to the attainment of departments with the same meaning as history, which have already been accredited in the case of geology and the evolutionary theory of natural history.

Because the psyche of the person is a product of social life, expressed in its person and especially in its intellectual organs capitalising psycho-physiological energies, it must serve as a measuring rod for the individual and for the stage of social development that has been reached. This capitalisation of personal energies in the social medium is implicit, especially in prehistoric times, a period almost as lengthy as the historic, delayed through innumerable anomalies and often subject to regressive movements staggering the evolution of social power, this is how development, differentiation and individualising of organisms during the foundation of the animal empire in the middle of the physical medium, proceeded of its own accord. One now considers the historical epochs, and one finds that in their progress the psychic units of the person, raised themselves only by a slight step. In spite of Christ's gospel coming later, we have few indications of regard for personal worth before the old Romans and Greeks, and even many of their good characteristics were forfeited. Modern culture is structured more on the basis of outer appearances than on intellectual values, more on the importance of valuables than on personal worth. Therefore modern culture is seen to be one-sided, yes, certainly in one sense : it places the object more highly than the subject, matter more highly than the person. From this sequence a standstill in the development of the cultured human is revealed, and this standstill can easily degenerate into an inferior state if soon there is not some help to recover from the existing anomaly. —

One now observes human culture from a point of stagnation in the capitalisation of higher personal energy potential, solitary earth-shaking events cause entire historic periods, yes, to dwindle in their significance into a momentarily passing episode in the development of humanity and the person. Humanity, in all probability, will most likely exist for millions of years yet. It will live through yet thousands more cycles of historical epochs, there will follow yet thousands more earth-shaking events one after another, the cultural centre will shift itself innumerable times from one point on our planet to another. Pragmatic history will tell of all these changes, but the future cultural historian will design for themselves a measuring stick made possible by the sociology of the personal values of the individual, and show how the progress and dimensions of the collective whole was reached by this means.

The astronomers and scientists of antiquity accounted for the existence of inorganic and organic nature in terms of a fixed state because they brought too slight a time and spatial coefficient into their calculation. Firstly with the invention of the telescope and the microscope, then with the newer discoveries in geology and the establishment of the evolutionary theory, the horizon of the natural subject expanded its measure so that a positive natural philosophy could be established on the same basis. The cultural historian also always committed the mistake of awarding the measure of the history of humanity too brief a time coefficient, therefore this also meant that single periods, cultural centres, events and personalities of a moderate proportion, acquired too great a meaning. Also cultural history has turned its attention until now, more towards monuments, artworks etc., than to the person himself. It considered more the intercellular substance than the living elements of the undivided social whole. In this sequence these features are also the measure that would have to serve as a standard for the determination of historical development or regressive movement, expressly avoiding considering the person himself as a product of the social life. Now this measure is obtained for cultural history by the determination of the socio-embryological laws of development. At the same time the horizon of cultural history has undergone an expansion by way of its reference to sociology with biology, just as the latter has gained in width and depth by way of the evolutionary theory. —

All that has just been said has relevance to the general history of culture, that itself begins with the history of philosophy. The specialist branches of cultural history on the other hand, that have individual countries and epochs as their subject, have a telling character, expressed in an approach which takes after more pragmatic historical research. This investigates the causal connections between events, and classifies epochs after other categories than sociology, this is due to the different starting points and purposes that each discipline pursues.

Concerning the philosophical meaning of the theory of the social organism, different declarations result, seemingly opposed to one another we must admit. The followers of historic materialism hold that the Organicer is an idealist, the followers of the idealistic world view look at it on the other hand as potentially materialistic, in that they come from the conviction that through the real organic view of society the ideal principle will emerge out of its last refuge place on earth, that social life, in which the infinite and unreal zone of matter will be ejected into being. —

We can now see to what extent the real organic view of society unanimously agrees with both world views, the materialistic, as well as the idealistic, and after being taken in these two directions it is placed thereby in a state of contradiction. —

The materialists fixed their theories upon the irreducible solidarity of the intellect and material in the individual : no intellectual motion without corresponding material turnover in the nerve organs, no feeling, thinking and desiring without corresponding release of mechanical, chemical, and physiological energies. According to the physical being the idealists agree therewith unanimously, in that they must admit that for a thinking brain, and for feeling and desire, a nervous system is necessary. Nevertheless the idealists always raise an objection, as soon as science gets somewhat closer to the original fixed point of the material processes that go with thinking, feeling and desiring in the human body, and especially when located simultaneously in the nervous system.

However for their part the materialists themselves forget, only too often, that the intellect has the nature of a power and that between power and material, although the one is not conceivable without the other, that nevertheless a contrast exists, yes, that in a definite regard is mutually negated. We can neither see nor touch a power without material, to be sure material also cannot exist without power ; but power nevertheless is the ideal principle, this applies to knowing ourselves that in the material state I exist ; therefore the idealists are also right in that the intellect is power. But then they prove the issue again by further executions based on incomplete consequences. In that they admit that the intellect is a power, they attach its concessionary clause thereto, this being that the intellect's nature is absolutely different to any other powers that are known in nature. Now it would justify them accordingly whether the proof to deliver or to indicate at least, in which moment and under which ratios this absolutely new power of the human body is associated with. They have however remained as yet in default of this proof, in contrast to which the progressive investigation of the natural subject according to the mechanical, chemical and physiological energies found in the organic world, and in the person, was gradually increasing and was able to perceive no moment that could be acknowledged as a sign of delineation between this and the psychic energies.

What is the Organicer to do now ? They seek themselves to deliver the proof that in social life the ratio between power and material is the same as between intellect and matter in our body, where however, in the social organism, the intellectual power is yet more potent than individual potential, this applies in that these are social psychic energies. Accordingly the material in the social body consequently forms itself in a manifold manner, and in freer forms than in the individual organism. Now on each higher step of coming into being in the physical world, in the unification of power and material, the psychic principle is increasingly dominant over the physical, a performance acknowledged by the Organicer of the ideal world view, but an essential unfortunately as yet not of service until they deliver the proof, that in the social organism power in

relation to the material reaches yet higher intellectual potential, such as the case is in the individual. In the fifth volume of our *"Thoughts Concerning the Social Science of the Future: Attempt at a Natural Theology"*, we proved, that in Christian theology the church could be seen as an expansion of Christ's body, and is therefore a real organism, and the ratio between the visible and the invisible church is indicated by the Christian dogma's theory, and is just like the ratio between the body and the soul in the person. Until now the intervening parts which could connect the concept of the individual with that of the substantial church was missing. This zone was only discovered by the Organicist, and was investigated. The operation of the zone was seen by them to be enriched by the Christian church's theory, which conceived of the solidarity of the individual in social life. Organic sociology accordingly offers the point of union between idealism and materialism, between the church's theory and the organic theory.

Does one want to raise again, on this occasion, the eternally old and always new question, of the possible manner : in which division of the body the soul is located, and remains during the life time of the person, and where it goes after the dissolution of the body ? — Sociology is, when scientific research, not obliged to deliver an answer to these questions. However organic sociology applies to individual consciousness, and that of any collectives, and so to social consciousness also, and we want to illuminate these questions from the sociological standpoint, arising out of the use of the organic method.

The social consciousness, arising from the joining together of parts, directs the thoughts and desires that follow in the persons forming the partnership, and stipulates the uniformity of the social and national life, it is a collective consciousness. This consciousness is always available throughout the entire social organism, and in each of its divisions. But all divisions are not to be found expressing the same degree of consciousness, and allowed to lead themselves according to its highest attainment. Most cellular elements of society behave according to an entirely instinctive or semiconscious programme. Even in the higher cultural state, it is always only a vanishingly small minority that is completely aware of the harmonisation of the living whole. Actually, in the normal state of existence the government must, as the central organ of the social nervous system, include this minority within itself. This however is not always the case, because social life is impeded by innumerable anomalies. Government agencies are often not developed uniformly, but rather, quite idiotic elements gain access. Then the higher units of consciousness in the other divisions and circles of society find refuge elsewhere : amongst the philosophers, scholars, artists, in the church, the army etc. Such mobility amongst the higher elements is therefore enabled within the social organism, because the elements forming the social nervous system are composed of persons that are not attached mechanically to one another, but rather, are mostly even wall cells, and can in a uniquely human manner, react against the social influences reaching them.

The human body also represents a collective of single cells. Therefore the individual consciousness is also always a collective consciousness and to give the correct statement : the soul is entirely within the entire body, and entirely within each of its divisions. But as in the social, not all divisions in the individual organism react uniformly to the unifying attractions. The attraction effect and the reaction to attractions, only impacts upon the higher elements, just as in the nervous system, and regarding its highest power within the human brain. Now however, because the elements forming the individual nervous system do not consist of wall cells, but rather form firm divisions of single nerve tissues and organs, individual consciousness is drawn, alongside the social, with greater continuity and continuation there from. Abnormality can occur, as for instance in the hysterical, hypnotic etc., where reception can be split, so the individual consciousness can also have the character of a mobile consciousness ; it divides into two or several centres of consciousness, as for instance the case is with the oscillations of self-confidence in hysterical persons. Therefore comparing individual consciousness with the social throws light on the developmental processes applying to both. What however the soul consists of, the sociologist can

explain in a manner similar to others, like the scientist regarding the existence of power and the philosopher in respect to the existence of thought, the feeling of willpower.

Where does social consciousness exist after the dissolution of the social association, where is the soul of the individual after the destruction of the body ? Would these questions be equivalent to the scientist asking the question : what happens to the energy of light and warmth self-dispersing in the world ? The hypothesis set up by us, of an intellectual ether fulfilling the role of an analogy to the light ether in the universe, is to be considered as an attempt to offer a solution to these questions. We therefore refer the reader who is so inclined, to the tenth section of our *“Attempt at a Natural Theology”*, which considers the theory of immortality. *

In what relation does the theory of the Organicist now stand, relative to the newly emerged theory of historical materialism ?

The latter is restricted by the proof it can deliver of its itself, how it is that society, and also the individual, is forced to provide itself first of all with satisfying the most urgent physical needs, so that next the psychic energies can be effective, one must admit, the followers of this theory are busy supplementing themselves with the wisdom of Athens, it is generally acknowledged that they want one truth more than any new discovery. The same also applies to the thesis that the person and society have their material existence and developmental properties stipulated by the surrounding physical medium, the atmosphere, the terrain, the climate etc. Already however in regard to the plant and animal species, science is not to be investigated solely by factors of location that co-operated in the development of the same, and so much more difficult it is in regard to the different human races and the whole collective. Already the materialistic rule is acknowledged to be incorrect : that the person becomes what he consumes in conformity to the social life : society has ingested what consumes it, in the progress of history. The followers of historical materialism do not even have a sharply defined rule they can be sure of attaching to their theory ; one considers however that they look at the entire developmental history of humanity as the result of the effect of economic factors, yet the plan they prefer is that only the satisfaction of individual physical needs is relevant, and that one is justified in asserting that all researches are equalised that trace all thoughts, feelings and wilful actions of the person back to the assimilation of certain nutrient.

The world is not ruled solely through hunger that is the outflow of the ego, but rather also by love. In social association, love through sympathy expands itself. Sympathy however is a product of the social reflection effect. The follower of historical materialism does not consider that the person, and especially the cultured person, is preferably thought of as a social product of the sympathetic life processes, and that the psychological capital which he commands is the result of innumerable reflection effects, that possibly existed in primitive society in a more narrowly confined manner, in connection with the economic modes, and that later, however, became independent of that which had preceded them. The North American Indian appeared to know and lead a hunting life, and America was partitioned according to no other economical modes until the first European settlers. These changes were entailed through the descent of a higher racial inheritance developed through upbringing in a higher social medium, ordered by the magnificent capital of personal psycho-physiological energies which completely reshaped the economical modes of the country, while set in the middle of the same physical medium. The accumulation of this personal capital took place however during immeasurable prehistoric and historic epochs, and was the result of uniquely human conformities to the different climatic and terrestrial conditions in which the ancestors of the settlers were located during their earlier phases of descent, and the result of the fight for existence of entire peoples and races, the products of selection becoming more

*) *Thoughts Concerning the Social Science of the Future*, Bk. V, p. 404.

innumerable generation by generation. The superior quality of this accumulating capital was not simply due to the interplay of economics, but rather more religious, ethical, intellectual and aesthetic factors occurring through the reflection effect. We emphasize only one of these factors, the religious. The origin of the piety that the first European settlers in North America revered is derived from Christianity, which arose from Mosaic roots, the source of the latter perhaps lying in the esoteric theory of the religious system of the Ancient Egyptians. Is it now possible the genesis, the distribution and later reshaping of the religious ideas that produced that piety, might be traced back to economic factors ? Do we now surmise that if North America had been populated by such settlers as would, by way of religious convictions and dogmas, of been forbidden to utilize meat for nourishment, to have no cotton clothing, and not to use metals ; that the economic modes of the country would not be entirely other than at present ?

Therefore ideas and economic modes are the means by which the world is ruled, but the Organicist adds, not only this : not individual, but social ideas. The isolated thought of the individual has neither social nor yet historical value, it receives this value only to the extent that it is transmitted in the words, writing, and artwork proclaimed by other people, by this means it acquires flesh and blood, due to the reflection effect it is taken into the nervous systems of other individuals and in this way becomes the common property of the social nervous system of a nationality, a religious partnership, or the whole of humanity. The Ten Commandments would have received neither a national value for the Jewish people, nor that of a universal value for humanity, had Moses let the stone tablets lie in Sinai, leaving the people without their contents to proclaim. If Christ had remained in the desert and his ideas not of been dispersed and gone forth with his disciples, the establishment of Christianity would of failed for the same reason. The comprehensive unification of Christianity was always only the further extension of the circle of thoughts and desires, lending to the people of Christianity the meaning of a world religion.

Just as we find behaviour during the heroic age when we look at Carlyle, the chief exponent of this period, innumerable exploits go unrecorded in history, having died away without a trace, innumerable joys, anonymous heroes on the battlefields without glory, innumerable thinkers, technicians and artists are overcome by the exertions and internal fights. Those personalities found in the historic rise of the heroic age, owe it to circumstances that placed them in the centre of the increased psycho-physiological reflection effect of their contemporaries. Alexander of Macedonia, Peter the Great, Frederick the Great, and Napoleon appear in history as outstanding focal points of cultural activity because of the higher social power they lived with and had command over. Personalities represent cellular elements in the relevant social nervous systems, around which new tissues and organs formed themselves, in addition to which the predecessors had contributed to their dissolution and reshaping. However this mainly happened only by way of the social reflection effect. Historic heroism we can see now, is not founded exclusively on the internal ethical values of the personality, as in regard to the manner of establishment in the case of Christianity, but rather, mostly, it can be traced back to external modes and circumstances, the heroic culture as understood by Carlyle is a moral absurdity. It is equivalent to idolizing the *fait accompli*, not that which is rare through its chance of reaching success. Outstanding thinkers, technicians and artists cannot therefore for their part count as a cultural value, because it is always only the most special part of one-sided potent psychic energies that is represented. Only the highest of all persons can serve as an object of culture, and such Christ was.

Language must be acknowledged as the original and primary means of each social reflection effect ; character, as well as artwork, can only be looked at in the same manner as an aid serving the accomplishment of the same purpose. Therefore the Organicist could of become a follower of the theory of historic materialism, while humanity remained the same, opposing the rule it consumed : humanity became what it spoke. The word is always the carrier of intellectual, religious, ethical, aesthetic, also the economic, legal and hierarchical-political reflection effects already in the primitive partnership of people ; being gradually included in the progress of history :

through the education of the higher social nerve organs in the person and in society, by always accumulating higher psychic energies in the individual and the social nervous systems, they become flesh. In the superior being of Christ the transformation of the word into flesh reached such a height that it was raised to the point where it was interpreted as the word of God, by the theory of Christian dogma.

We are not driven by a desire to express these ideas, but rather only to indicate that the organic method is far removed from that of the materialistic world view, leading in the opposite direction by offering the means to theology to bring the results of the natural subject into harmony with the religious strivings and commands.

Finally we only want to emphasize the contrast between the economically-materialistic, and the psycho-organic views of social events, from the standpoint of manifest progress. Economic progress always resides in a more comprehensive division of labour, in an economic concurrence that is always more intensive ; in an ever greater increase of capital wealth, and always in a complex economy based on money. When general means of exchange and price are standardized, money represents a quantitative size and applies pressure to the economic sphere in all aspects of its performance, building up the necessary formation of a mechanical character. Economic progress therefore leads to the conveyance of selfish drives in social life, becoming a mechanism acting increasingly on its behalf. On the other hand from the standpoint of the organic view of social events, progress consists of an increasing predominance of the psychological over the mechanistic, so the altruistic drives preside over the selfish. The unification caused by the organic reflex process, induced thoughts and desires to share and discover, due to the psychic expression of sympathy an inclination was established in the individual prompting the intention to accord fellow men what they required without equivalent return services of a like kind ; the law of supply and demand established economic trade in valuables and services for the opposite foreign currency : give less and you will receive more, sell more expensive and buy cheaper. The reflex process orchestrates the exchange and distribution of ideas, as well as the accumulation of psychic energies with a higher potential in the individual and the social nervous system ; the economic process on the other hand addresses the purposes of ownership and the exchange of goods, as well as the aggregation of valuables. Between the idea and the valuable object prevails the same contrast as between power and matter, and the more superior the idea the more prominent this contrast becomes.

This may suffice in order to designate the idealistic bias of the organic method. But the Organicist when a scientific researcher is obligated to fathom the process through which the genesis, the exchange, that stipulates the distribution and capitalising of ideas occurs, and this process is not primarily purely psychic, but rather a psycho-physiological facet of society, as it is also within the individual. And being psycho-physiological, this process can then again be acknowledged only if society itself is interpreted as a living individual, i.e. as a real organism. He who denies the reality of the social organism, withdraws the object of research itself from the reach of science. Then the use of real comparisons and the inductive method in the scientific sense is impossible, and the researcher is forced to make use of the hypothetical method that has proved until now to be completely unfruitful in the area of the social sciences. The results of comparison between different social formations however, according to the performance of the proven established method, could not itself possibly lead to the discovery or determination of any necessary laws of social events, because by this means it was always only the results of accidental historical events that could be compared with one another. Therefore the majority of those following the determination of any necessary laws which apply to social events, are led by the method of historical comparison towards the sceptics that maintain there are no general laws in the scientific sense, that can be given for society coming into being. This statement, that must immediately be acknowledged as logically untenable, was already factually refuted on behalf of the

Organicist by the determination of an entire series of positive laws that are jointly applicable to social life and all living nature. The achievements of sociology in this direction, on the part of the anti-Organicist, did not learn until now, because the scientific view of social events is completely strange to the latter, and also due to their lack of the necessary knowledge of biology, to praise the deeper sense, and the range and philosophical value of the acquisitions of positive sociology. For what one has no understanding of and can make no sense of, one becomes an enemy of. That is unfortunately also a law of social events.

As yet we have touched in the briefest manner, the totality of objections that have been proposed against the use of the organic method in sociology. With this method recognising human society as an individual living being, and giving the impression of a real organism, the Anti-organicist becomes studious first of all to negate the real character of social events.

1. The individual social groups and the countries forming political units do not exist as firmly joined tissues and organs, is the first assertion, like those organisms of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, but rather consists of persons, who move freely in space and arrive in conjunction with one another only exceptionally, and only accidentally come into direct and substantial contact, while they arbitrarily leave any associations that they belong to and enter into other associations, and yes, they can belong to several partnerships at the same time.

We have already refuted all objections that are traced back to space and time ratios by our preceding discussions. How about the consequences of the behaviour of following after each other however, or the simultaneous membership of the same individual to different partnerships ?

We designated the social associations as nerve systems. Between the concept of body and system in regard to the natural subject, there is nothing more essential to distinguish than the original fixture of their relationship. All systems of firm bodies represent the movement of atoms and molecules gripped together, just as our sun's system consists of a group of planetary bodies. In both cases the movements are subject to the same mechanical laws. Exactly as the social was itself developed out of the existing nervous systems of the individual, after the same laws as apply to multicellular organisms, and especially as apply to the nervous systems of the individual arising out of the neurones. As in the social, so it is in the adjoining cells of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, although it is to a lesser degree that the tissues and organs are bound together in the former. From this it now clearly follows how the same person can belong to one after another, or simultaneously to two or several associations. In that in each case it happens in the same manner, like the wild journey of a comet travelling out of one world system into another. However if a celestial body the size of our sun should now approach us, the attractive force exercised by such a body would produce an interference in the balance of our sun's system. Planets lying closer to the newly appeared celestial body would be attracted by it more powerfully than the others. A battle between two centres of attraction would emerge and in the progress of this battle, part of the planets would be influenced and would belong at the same time to the force of attraction of each centre ; therefore they would belong to both systems at the same time. Such an interference in the pivotal ratios of West European countries exercised the papal force in the Middle Ages. The mind gravitates towards two opposing centres of attraction in Germany, to the monarchy of the imperialistic force, and to the papacy. The people who felt their mind was torn in two directions belonged simultaneously to two different social nervous systems, whose activities did not occupy a position of unanimous agreement and where there was also temporarily a state of open warfare between the two. Do not forget however that the solidarity of the individual in social situations is not determined by mechanical, but rather by psycho-physiological forces. The psycho-physiological affinity is the intensity of attachment that people have for each other in society, and that can also only be understood by means of psycho-physiological dissimilation. In the social organism the focal points of intellectual and ethical energy themselves correspond to the

gravitational centres of attraction, that through reflection are made known as social energy changing mechanical movement in space. There however the spiral, after which the energies raise themselves to higher potentialities, one can be sure they are gradually climbing, but yet always passing through the same recurring parallel points of orbit that are always to be found in the higher spheres of developmental accretion, that are analogous with the lower spheres of unanimous agreement. Such an analogy represents for us, apart from the level of the energy potentials, the social and the mechanical system. As far-reaching as this analogy appears to be, nevertheless it throws a clear light on events occurring in space and in social life.

In its ascent of the spiral route toward the upper limits of the developmental stages of the social organism, in regard to the organic world it is also brought into positions of perihelion and aphelion, that bring it closer to the lower organisms than the higher orders of living beings. So the social nervous system, in regard to the mobility of individual elements and the changeableness of its structure, shows so many analogies with the lower species of life in the animal kingdom. This justifies the comparison between social dynamics and the process of coming into being throughout the entire organic world. At the same time the differences between the energy potentials must also always be extolled and emphasised properly. And this was also always observed by the Organicist. The reproach was therefore wrongly made against them, that due to them the social organism would become identified with the natural world. The assembly of an analogy is implicit and yet not identical, but rather it shows only that there are certain commonalities between the evolution of social dynamics and coming into existence in nature.

2. The social organism is not as one maintains it is, immediately comparable to the individual organism, neither is it born nor subject to death.

All social associations, all countries, emerged originally through the division of those already in existence. This also happens still in the current day in each new colonisation that leads to one more or less independent living whole of the subsidiary. All natural organisms are themselves also originally increased through division ; only by modification of the original increase is development sensed, the sexual method of fertilization being the medium of division.

One will probably respond that most countries have been established by conquest. — It is now implicit however that the nature of each conquest takes after that of a fertilization process. One observes, like the numerous assemblies of spermatozoa swarming about the feminine cell violently attempting the same intrusion, one has a picture coddled together of a battle between an enterprising, more mobile, active population and a passive one. Firstly the victor subdues the population they have overcome, subjecting them to the active masculine power, which subjugates the passive feminine element. Gradually however the two become united, fusing into one another, and a new, transformed organism comes into being, as a unit develops from the duality. In such a transformation and harmonisation of elements however, the being exists in a like manner to each naturally occurring fertilization process. When assembling these analogies we did not draw on a consideration of the ethical factor, although we completely acknowledge its value. In the convolutions of each social dynamic it is impossible to itemize all factors in every new discussion.

Death comes to social associations, yes entire countries, just as it does in individual organisms. Extermination through war leads to the disappearance of entire populations that fall from the surface of the earth in a sequence of terrestrial cataclysms, together with the death of the whole collective they had formed. But also the gradual solution of a society through illness, disorganisation, exhaustion, paralysis of the living core, failure of the life source, is possible and, although these conditions do not pass in so short a time and due to such incidental symptoms, how such with the individual is the case. We described these conditions, their origin and sequences in detail in our *Social Pathology*. * A population that completely lost a conscious sense of its unified

*) *Social Pathology*, Bk. II of *The International Library of Sociology*.

status would no longer have an organic form, but rather only exist as a contiguous form, exactly like the trees of a forest and the grass blades of a meadow. Such a society has ceased to exist as a concrete organism ; it has decomposed into its individual components ; it forms only a discrete collection. Spencer and his followers for their part however, even deliberately hold that associations of living countries are discrete collections. We have already indicated earlier on, the one-sidedness to which such a view leads.

3. Spencer raised the objection that organisms are constructed, those that belong nominally to the highest orders are symmetrical, in contrast to which the social organism represents the negation of each symmetry.

However the independent central organ of each social organism maintains control about itself according to the manner in which the different classes of the population are layered, with the higher more closely, and the lower stored more remotely. Each country represents a hierarchy of cells, tissues and organs, and the arrangement of the associations is delineated second, third and so on. Categories among one another and in regard to the central forces, manifest themselves in the symmetrical building of each country. The arrangement and symmetry in the social organism obviously does not simply arise as a result of mechanical and chemical factors, which are the causes operating according to the nature of organisms, but rather they are also distinguished through psychic forces ; which prevail however in regard to symmetry, and also in all dynamics, only always more graduated and less absolute according to whether acting between the social or the individual organism. — In our work : *The Graphic Method in Sociology* * we graphically represented the concentric hierarchies of the different social elements and therefore proved the role of symmetry in the building of social associations according to a geometric fashion.

4. Society, one finally objects, controls no joint self-awareness ; its form represents no self-conscious I, like each individual ; it is only a collection of feelings — a condition of consciousness.

Positive psychology and nominal psychiatry have arrived at the result that individual self-awareness, and consciousness likewise, are only collectives, in that they must be looked at as the result of the co-operation and life of all cellular elements forming the organism. Accordingly the extent of individual consciousness is always fluctuating ; each ensuing moment follows on from the one preceding it ; it is subject to the interruptions of sleep for instance ; it is periodical in that it always sways between increasing tensions and a state of balance ; it is moreover wandering in that it is transported by external attractions, memories, and internal tensions arising from latent energies out of one division of the central organ into another where it remains temporarily fastened. Also the different feelings and states of social consciousness corresponds to all this. They also represent things collectively accrued, being subject to interruptions, and periodical variations, arising through manifold interconnections. Regarding social unification, the form and location of ideas and desires is not simply a summation of the individual conditions that are present, but is rather the result of a harmonisation attained by organic means, and is also the same as that regarding the case of individual consciousness. Social consciousness is not simply analogous to that of the individual, but rather at the same time homologous to it, in that it represents an organic potential of the psycho-physiological energies. There must be an acknowledgement that first of all the results of psychology and psychiatry must be refuted ; until this happens the sociologist is justified in relying upon this, and in constructing the social psychology on the basis of the individual. —

All this protest does not spring from a collective source, namely the circumstances that social bodies retain, or around our terminology, to the social nervous system the observer is like plastic, through certain restricted forms and formations it represents itself as being like an individual organism, instead of as one discrete collection existing in space and time. We saw how

*) In volumes III and IV of *The Annals of the International Institute of Sociology*.

unfounded and unscientific such a view is. Every limb of an undivided society can communicate with the entire being through its senses, just as some interpret how a cell acts toward the entity to which it belongs. The tissues, organs and the whole organism certainly project the single cell as a confusion of apparently loosely ordered movements, its functions being attended to only as a result of unconscious and instinctive participation. Although the person is now more aware of himself and his position in the social association where there is the higher psycho-physiological potential of their being, nevertheless the connection between the laws of regulation and social dynamics escapes them just as well as in the case of the individual cell, and it may serve as a proof that even now there is the outspoken conviction on the part of outstanding intellects that there would be no general regularity in social development otherwise. Concerning the development of the plastic form of the social body, and being in a position to judge it, the person would have to be gifted with other organs than those over which he has control now. For the same reason he can also form for himself no picture of the psycho-physiological harmonisation of social consciousness. He interprets only the movements and functions of the individual factors that lead to the manufacture of the same. He feels, thinks and wants to feel, thinks and desires only as an individual ; he contributes to the entirety of an unknown size, although it is instinctive, semiconscious and only exceptionally is the entirety manufactured deliberately through this cause, as also applies to the cell in the cell's territory.

But as the oneness of global systems can only be perceived from an enormous distance, likewise can social consciousness be brought into harmony with the individual if one observes it from the height of the religious view. Christianity teaches : I not feel, nor would think and desire for myself, but rather be aware of a higher power in me ; in God is life, woven into us. Just as one does not feel, think and desire, if one places himself on the Christian religious standpoint, the individual unit and humanity as each complete in themselves, but rather that God prevails in each human living together, as well as in the entire story of humanity. In addition this outlook may contribute in evoking the conviction that the organic method in sociology, correctly used and understood, does not lead to a materialistic, but rather, to an idealistic world view.

Although the preceding objections must now be acknowledged as unfounded, they nevertheless carry about them a scientific character. This belongs to another category of protest entirely, that comes from a complete ignorance of the accomplishments of current biology and positive psychology, as well as from an incorrect and superficial view of the organic method itself.

Let us follow for ourselves the questions that the Anti-organicist asks :

What can there be in common between an elephant and a monarchy, between a whale and a republic ?

Could this question be answered, likewise, when the question is directed at a geologist or an astronomer : what can there be in common between a grain of sand and the planet Jupiter, between a stone pebble and the shining star ?

The answer is only too clear : the dissimilarities are based upon space, time and energy ratios, not a common regularity between the comparisons.

Another demand of the Anti-organicist is that they would like the location of the hands, the feet, the nose, the eyes and ears and the remaining members of the social organism to be shown.

Because each social association consists of individuals, it also encloses within itself all forces through which individual life is stipulated. It is not simply psychic forces that reign in the social organism, but rather also chemical and mechanical energies, consequently acting in another arrangement corresponding to the social purposes and composition. The social organism has no hands and feet, but the psycho-physiological energies upon whose interaction the unified social life rests, applies itself in the final act exactly as it does with the individual organism, through mechanical work, as we have already explained. So it also has developed for itself no social eyes, but specific energies, organs that in the individual differentiate into ears, increased learning in

social life occurs through the unified cause of a greater or lesser number of individuals that jointly develop and instruct its specialist aptitudes and talents. In this sense an academy of the arts is a social organ which corresponds in the plastic arts to vision, as does music regarding the ear.

A French pseudo sociologist even inquires after a full apprehension of where the secretions of the social organism are stored, and where the channels of excretion are located. — Such an Anti-organicist does not simply want to see the social organism, but rather also to be yet smelling and feeling it.

Those critics of the organic method in sociology who choose to interpret, instead of adopting the same approach, content themselves with forming an entirely special category therewith to emphasize, under possibly hundreds of failed analogies, a difference between the dynamics of social life and those of the living world, simply in order to attack the method itself in this way. Such a procedure does not prove itself any more readily than the views of the Organicist, all of whom, after looking at social dynamics from all directions are unanimous in their agreement. One also admits now that some Organicist's individual analogies have been superficial and interpreted hastily, and when proposed these can become just as good a proof against the organic method in sociology as those inexact observations drawn from an individual scientist's experiments for demonstrating the uselessness of the inductive method in the study of the natural subject. The public at large, that does not read the majority of the very extensive works of the Organicists, accordingly judges the value of the organic method from individual examples extracted out of context from the entire system. The means by which newly established philosophical, and scientific systems, reach everyone, makes them both subject to this fate. The same procedure was brought into use against Darwin's theory of evolution. An illustrated newspaper produced a sequence of figures : the first represented a mollusc, a snake followed, a crocodile, a goose, a giraffe, a donkey, an ape and finally a modern dandy in an overcoat with a top hat on the head, a monocle in the eye and a cigar in the mouth. This caricature was equipped with the weighty inscription : Darwin's evolutionary theory. A scientific system cannot be refuted through the application of such a procedure, and, not least, this is so of the organic theory in sociology because it is established on already proven acquisitions in biology and positive psychology. In order to shake that sociological system, these acquisitions must first of all be acknowledged as unfounded. However the Anti-organicist carefully skirts around this page of the entire system in order to attack only some advanced points of the same. Under the name of the latter, the primary objective now is also to prove this to be weakly established, yet the citadel remains standing in which the main force of the entire system is concentrated, namely the insoluble connection between all events occurring in human society with the process of coming into being in nature.

The founding thesis of the Organicist : *nihil est in societate quod non prius fuerit in natura*, holds conviction as strongly as the idealistic, and the materialistic standpoint. For the idealists would have to reach a point beyond this thesis at the end of which God would appear in nature to prevail in the manner of the known laws of nature. The idealists could therefore complete the thesis through the addition *nisi Deus*, likening the spiritualistic to the sensualistic thesis : the *nisi intellectus* added to *nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu*. In so far as the materialists acknowledge the rule of the higher intellectual powers, they are for their part forced to make reference to the same thesis. Neither one nor the other of these standpoints can therefore undermine the bases of the organic theory.

It was rightly emphasised that sociology has to do battle with the prejudices against its alien ideas. — The prejudices of modern society do not escape the long period necessary to overcome superstition of the evil view of the witch and the devil ; nowadays it is nourished by incorrect scientific views, partly intellectual and political passions, which is how religion during the Middle Ages grew into a state of fanaticism. Sociology established on a scientific basis now has as part of

its task to engage all such prejudices, wherefrom all the reasons become clear why it becomes engaged with so many passionate and inconsiderate ideologies and becomes an enemy of them.

Before we go any further we want to focus attentively upon the meaning that the use of the organic method in sociology could also have for biology and nominally for physiology.

Human society is a real organism, all events occurring within the living substance must be subject to three standards, namely the change in matter, form and energy. Verworn designates the reason underlying the principle of energy change to a continually active process storing the potential of chemical energy, and the transferral of that energy into other forms of energy. * The potential of the psychic energies in the social organism itself arose from a specific original chemical-mechanical energy, and the energy change receives the character of a psychic energy change in that process of change. What is more, for its part the latter is also always accompanied by a corresponding change in material and form, as we have demonstrated in the preceding statements. Events occurring in the social organism are therefore exactly in keeping with the principles applying throughout the entire living world. At the present time however energetics belongs to the darkest and least explored zone of physiology; the conversion of energies from one form into another are as yet a long way from being explained, and yes, the concepts of individual energy forms have as yet not been determined. **

Is it now asked : in respect of higher potentials and on a wider basis, if a comparison can be made between self-regulating social energy changes, and the ways in which events occurring in the individual organism can shed light on the latter regarding a few things ? Proceeding with the statement of Johannes Müller : physiology can only be attached to definitive results by means of comparison, and this can only be implemented in the most comprehensive sense by consulting the social organism and bringing it into the circle of physiological investigation.

Embryology represents just as dark a zone as energetics. One probably knows that the simple cell increases itself through division and the same process that had taken place in the mother cell before, repeats itself in the daughter cells. But according to what means in the multicellular organism the single cell arrives after being expelled out of it as a germ cell, repeatedly, in addition to the evolution of the entire organism, has not as yet been made clear. In Germany the compartment of embryological attributes divides itself into two repositories : the Preformationists, His, Roux and Weismann, which represents the theory of organ forming germ locations, and on the other hand the Epigenesists : Pflüger, Hertwig, Driesch and Haeckel, asserting that the external factors have the decisive effect in the embryological reshaping of the cell. In England, Darwin set up for its part a theory of Pangenesis.

The simplest cellular element in the social organism is the person. The higher nervous organs, that distinguish the person from the animals, are the product of the ancient people composing society during the entire progress of prehistoric and historical development, before the individual undergoes any psycho-physiological energy change. As a child every single individual joins a sequence of increasingly higher social associations where increments of ancestral inheritance are already available. The same likewise happens with each simple cell that is born in the confines of a multicellular organism. Both must bring themselves into adaptation with the incremental inheritance if there is an imbalance of accumulated energy; both, after their birth into the organic medium to which they belong, must come into step with it in their interactions ; through the attraction effects of the whole organism the individual is moulded to the higher potential and differentials in a uniquely human manner. In both cases of descent this process is to be designated

*) Max Verworn : *General Physiology*, p. 558

**) Ebendas. p. 556.

according to its being a process of upbringing. Now in society however this process, by occupying an extended period of time and more expansive modes of space, goes before itself, that is to say it precedes each act of implementation. Therefore a comparison of the embryological events in the living world with what is understood to take place in the social world under the designation of upbringing, in the most comprehensive sense of the word, could also throw light upon the area of the developmental mechanism in physiology. —

For the same reasons positive psychology's theory of the social organism could prove to be of service to so many. The change in social energy is itself directly connected to the results of the enervation occurring in the individual nervous system. The genesis of feeling, thinking and desiring in the individual comes from thoughts of unification and the desire to mediate that must be completely homologous in the social organism, therefore the individual nervous system must be linked by analogy through direct attraction effects and through indirect reflection to the social nervous system and its energy change. With the indirect reflection effect the energy change in the social nervous system is delayed by the interruption of social enervation and split into two special activities, by which means the process of social enervation is illustrated for the observer with greater clarity and more certainty than is possible in the individual nervous system, and nominally in the brain, where the situation is one of a restricted space comprised of millions of cells. We already noted above that the attraction transmission from one ganglion cell to another in our brain is not of a substantial kind, just as the situation is between other cells, but that rather the effect is preceded by indirect contact. This mode of attraction transmission can only be explained by means of an analogy with the effect of indirect reflection occurring in the social nervous system. Psychology must therefore also include the theory of the social organism within the circumference of its induction in order to obtain a wider basis than is possible simply by means of comparative science.

It is to the slight advantage of the organic method that its view of society is not that of a state of cells, in the manner that sociology takes the meaning of a cellular sociology. An emerging cellular physiology and a cellular psychology are yet to be grasped. The sociologist begins their endeavours from a point therefore where the object is to attain these sciences only. Now the sociologist as a scientist with the accomplishment of their observed goal could ease the task of the psychologist in that they attach the results of sociology to those of biology. — For our part we also interpreted social pathology as a cellular pathology after the manner of Virchow's exposition.

The discovery of purely economical laws, already prove the value of biology. In the domain of economics Adam Smith assessed the laws concerning the division of labour and the physiologist has recognised that the principle has the same meaning for all living beings, and made the point attentively. Darwin attested to the fact that he received his first stimulus toward the idea of a theory of selection from the work of Malthus, concerning the law of populations. Therefore it is to be expected that by the definitive constitution of sociology the results of sociological researches will acquire an as yet unsuspected meaning for the natural subject, and especially for biology and positive psychology, that must be looked on as a part of biology.

Finally, by way of an expansion of the natural view generally, in its entire circumference by way of its reference to sociology, it can become attentive of the natural subject. The naturalistic view will not succeed simply through extension, but rather also through depth. And each gain in depth in the naturalistic view is at the same time a gain for a more ideal world view. We repeatedly referred to the meaning of the organic method in relation to this direction in our earlier work and here we can only refer the reader to the same statements.

In that the organic method summarizes the events occurring in society and in nature under one nominal order, it is not simply a supplement to clarification, but rather thereby also to the simplification of many views within both departments. Here we offer only an example. Natural

ideas are as yet without a valid philosophy for any of their foundations. There is a bottomless abyss to bridge that divides the natural subject that has, except until now, been securely fixed in position. That sociology now escapes thanks to the use of the organic method that delivers the proof that the right way to form the final image of life toward which the state drives in society, shows that the morphological energies in individual organisms are simply analogous to, but rather also are not homologous to, it establishes not simply the entire zone of jurisprudence in a simplified manner based on the firm foundation of the natural subject, but rather also through this gives access to this zone that as yet rests upon the more intricate and artificially itemized building of more logical, ethical and metaphysical postulates. We have explained that the anomalies that come to the fore in the correct sphere have a unifying effect, as we have explained in detail*, by analogy, with regard to the condition of histological illness in individual organisms, likewise also the economical, physiological and the political drives and biases in individual organisms are to be accounted for. Of this subject an, as yet, extensive field of sociological researches opens itself up before us. —

In Germany, we admit as much, the organic method in sociology is brought into being and put to use only by Schäffle, although subject to many reservations.** René Worms must be acknowledged as the outstanding representative of this method in France.*** In England, Spencer and his school is, as we have seen, stuck in a midway position. In Italy, the organic method finds only little accord.

On further executions of historical literature, in respect of the framework we have already drawn in this study, we must renounce the possibility of there being any more to emerge.

In the presentation of our views, we deliberately sort to remove every contentious word out of the way. The well known saying : where the idea is missing, in time a word adjusts itself to the need, could be expressed in the usage of critics of all times as follows : where the proofs are absent, in time a word comes to stand in opposition in their place. Now, however, they like words to belong nominally to the zone of science, still they can be without substance, and yet always cause so much confusion, that we cannot withdraw ourselves from the task of defending the place of the organic method in sociology. —

A violent contention over the burning question in sociology, as to whether the social association would have to be interpreted as a natural organism or as a superorganism, is in its final phase.

However the word superorganism has now become associated with a double meaning. — One may interpret society as a superorganism in the sense that social dynamics only represent a higher power of the same kind of energies which are known to be active throughout the entire living world, this designation would give rise to no objections from the standpoint of the organic method. One could contrast with just as much right, the super organization in a higher animal species relative to that of the low animal species and the plant world, in that the nervous system represents a super-organization as compared to the designated bone and muscle systems. One does not however conceive of this designation in relative terms, but rather in a superior absolute sense that attributes to social dynamics in the organic world a position that is regulated on an absolutely different basis, splitting the unified appearance of the world into two halves, that have nothing in common relative to one another. Then sociology has the firm foundation of the natural subject withdrawn from it, and must renounce its application to be a positive science. At the present time

* *Social Pathology*, Chapter IV, V and VI.

**) *The Building and Life of the Social Body*.

***) René Worms : *Organisme et Société*.

however the position of the Superorganicists is deprived of any proofs of an absolute distinction between natural and supersocial dynamics, its contrast with the organic theory degenerates into so many disputes over words, that prove its nature to take after that of infinity, with every motion being like that within an empty void. —

According to the propositions of some sociologists of this category, the distinct forms of behaviour are due to energy potentials, from which social dynamics derive their dualistic character. And consequently every social association is to be understood, after the opinion of these sociologists, namely as being the result on the one hand of natural necessities while they are determined on the other hand by the freewill of the person. As natural necessities become at the same time the physical medium that growth designates, the materials of nourishment, the protection devices, generation and so on. On the other hand social relations (gathering together the various social forms after the terminology of the French and English sociologists) by corresponding actuation of the individualistic free wills, become determined more by all members of the social association. The entire theory of the social contract was made to rest upon this view, when its chief representative J. J. Rousseau was obliged to consider willpower. If a republican is introduced into a country where there is a government supporting monarchy, by means of a liberal law determined by the vote of people meeting, or in effect a parliament, here by the will of the monarch an ordinance in the conservative sense of a generally binding standard, is introduced according to the conventional method, in a sequence leading to more absolutely free individual and socially wilful actions that restricts by no necessities the physical needs of the individual, as well as the purely material processes in social life that are controlled by necessary natural laws.

We now seek to deliver our account of this matter, to what extent the individual and the collective unit must be recognized as free and to what extent they are beings bound by necessities.

By the requirement to breathe the person is placed in the most direct state of dependence upon the atmosphere surrounding them, they find they can only go without air for extremely short intervals of time, and for the same need there is also no substitute. But in regard to the stuff of nourishment, their freedom of choice is already increased, and the same to a yet greater degree applies to means of protection : clothing, structures, weapons and so on. The extent of self-determination extends itself still further for the cultured human in regard to planned change, choice and the invention of the means of production, exchange and the accumulation of valuables, form of associations and so on. But also on the highest cultural level human freedom will not be restricted simply to this extent by natural necessities which are not confined to the physical, but rather to fulfil the psychic needs of the person material means are also always necessary .

On the other hand the individual is also bound, as well as society is, in the choice and the determination of the so-called form of social relations likewise by necessities. Each association is forced of itself into a hierarchical constitution in order to arrive at a state of harmonisation in the cooperation of all its divisions ; each society, especially if she commands herself as an independent country, of necessity for its existence needs a government and therefore a central organ which is the cause of, and introduces harmonisation. Each organ of government can for its part only consist of persons, even like society, and these are necessarily tied to the conditions of existence of each human personality as well as that of the entire country. Wherein does the freedom of the members of a society exist now, in regard to the choice of a republican or monarchical form of government ? It is restricted to the determination whether the central organ has to consist of a multiplicity of persons or is to be centred on a single person and on the choice of the persons in a republic and the choice of a monarch. As soon as they come to life the stimulus to action for the central organ is stipulated on their part again by uniquely human external and internal social necessities. Each government is forced when devising the measures it takes, to consider the state of the foundations that are encountered in which the unified division of the social nervous system is imbedded, to consider the units of physical and psychic inheritance of the population, the formation of the social

tissues and organs are typically already preformed historically, they have already reached a cultural stage of development, and so on. The same is also fully valid with reference to all the stimulus to action that occur of their own accord, in the confines of society generally. One could make a cross-section through any social body in any direction one cared to, and one would come across the presence of both factors, being himself convinced thereby of the presence of freedom and necessity in all spheres of social life ; only the ratio between freedom and necessity would prove to be variable in the different spheres. Now it is the straightforward task of sociology when a pure science, to investigate the necessities of social dynamics, in other words the necessity of the causal connection between social appearances ; set against the determination of how the free will of the person has to operate in the midst of these necessities, how he exploits the causal connections of social dynamics and should act appropriately toward them and reach a higher stage of development to which the statesman aspires, in the most comprehensive sense of the word, the object of the various forms of statesmanship. —

It is not only appropriate to note here that in most cases of kinship the individual person makes for himself illusions over the measure of freedom accruing to him ; he feels often the extensive degree to which he is bound by the partnership of descent through family status, position, occupation, religious orientation and so on. One does not just forget that each individual is born into an already established partnership, and that each partnership is the product of historic events which were not stipulated simply by wilful actions and coincidence, but rather also by an abundance of necessities occurring in a uniquely human manner. — It could not be explained how any social necessities would exist, that in a cultural centre separated completely from the rest of the world, like for example in the case of the Aztec state and the Inca empire, the same national types applied on the day they appeared, exactly as those that always formed themselves in the old world. The Aztec empire was based on feudalism with a chosen monarchy as in Poland formerly, and the Inca empire was an absolute monarchy constructed on a democratic base, as in China of the present day. There are only two pure types of governmental form : the republic and the monarchy, that confront us in all forms seen throughout the entire world, either viewed as a unit or as a multiplicity. The developmental stages of the remaining countries present themselves as only intermediate forms, of which one is more of a republic while the other approaches more to the monarchic state. The Aztecs and Incas could not act differently when choosing between the single mode available, through which laws of government prescribed social growth by a process of selection. Likewise the economic and legal modes in both empires had formed themselves according to their being after the same standards as the old world had known earlier, and as are yet realized now in different countries. The Aztecs and Incas were not directed according to anyone, but rather listened to the unavoidable necessities of social dynamics. Also all religious partnerships, all economic associations, everyone likewise follows such necessities according to any joint purposes which societies are pursuing, and so the forms that arise as a consequence are restless and changeable. And the reason this happens is either because it is grasped even in the germ of what the countries represent, or forms a fraction of the countries whose internal construction is encapsulated with all the essential factors of reproduction.* It does not at the same time oblige each individual, each partnership, as well as causing each country to exert effort in accordance with an inappropriate purpose ; but it becomes the necessary sequence that can be pursued, that conduct must reach after. In the initial setting the individual and the partnership will advance in their development, reaching a higher cultural stage, while in the final setting its movements will necessarily be regressive, reaching different pathological forms, with ensuing disorganisation, followed finally by death.

* See my study : Ya-t-il une loi de l'évolution des formes politiques ? Bk. II of *The Annals of the International Institute of Sociology*.

The same unavoidable connection between freedom and necessities are also known in ant and bee societies, where at the same time they are only directed by a very much narrower latitude of freedom, as a consequence of the low developmental stage of these societies. Ant society must be looked on as a republic, and the bee's society as a monarchy. The bee's king is selected and is raised to the execution of its function. An unfortunate choice can also be made, as in every choice of a monarch. Yet however an error can also only exist no matter how it may be restricted where freedom of action is available. The animal is also an individual, equally so with the person, in whom choice of its nourishment, its residence, its females, its defences and means of attack can be made by himself. It therefore certainly enjoys freedom after this direction, although its boundaries are pulled more narrowly inward than applies to the person, this is especially so however regarding the cultured human.

From what is predicted it now follows that the stimulus to action of the individual and the social organism may be distinguished according to two categories, of which one occurs through necessary laws of nature and the other is determined by the free will of the person, each is without any real contents ; these classifications are established only on the determinations of words that can lead, through this means, only to the occasion of disputes over words. The social contract was a historical hypothesis, like that of the golden age and other utopian ideals. A positive science may not establish its researches upon such hypotheses. —

For classifications to be traced back toward word determinations that are without the substance of generally recognised social forms, all things must be added to them that fail to correspond to the categories already assessed in biology. Such a procedure always leads to the separation of sociology from its natural basis, that of biology and positive psychology. All social energies made subject to the organic method must be investigated according to their meaning as powers of biological energies ; to make this the subject of another classification could only extend the confusion in the execution of analogies between social and organic dynamics. For our part we have summarized social forms and their actuation under three categories : the economic, judicial and hierarchical-political. These categories correspond on the one hand to the arrangement of biology in physiology, morphology and *Tektologie* (anthropology, zoology, botany), on the other hand to the specialist disciplines which already exist, that have society as their objective : national economy, jurisprudence, politics (science of the state in the narrower sense). This classification medium attaches sociology to each corresponding sphere of biological form appropriate to the discipline, and refers it on the basis of the natural foundations upon which it has been raised. The confusion that now rules over sociological areas will only come to an end then if biogenetic classifications proposed on behalf of the investigation of social dynamics become established. In the opposite setting they will only lead to endless word disputes, that also extends the determination of each word without substance, that is only established after a terminology. —

The newly emerged theory of historical materialism also gives rise to multiple occasions for word disputes. — The social energy change always comes into being as we have already proved, by mechanical and chemical realisation and new formations of material components, both in the individual and in the accompanying social nervous system. There can therefore be an economy of the social nervous system in the sense of speech, like a physiology of the individual nervous system and especially of the human brain. The followers of historical materialism do not however interpret the economy of social dynamics in so comprehensive a sense, for otherwise this theory faced with that of the Organicist would collapse. Under social economy historical materialists understand economic life in the narrower sense, namely the annexation, production, distribution and consumption of goods, that are determined preferably in addition to the granting of satisfaction to physical needs and that come to be summarized under the general concept of nutrient and protective devices. Now however the materials of nourishment and protection devices cannot in the social, as also in the individual organism, be a direct reflection of production, but rather must be

transformed after they become assimilated by the individual and the individual has adapted herself to the same, before transforming into psychic energies. How far however the manner of assimilation of the nutrient is reliant upon the distant education of the nerve organs that are to be looked at as the material carriers of the higher psychic energies, follows from the fact that these organs arrive in accordance with socio-embryological laws in the individual at full maturity only after the recapitulation of the entire preceding psychic developmental history of their ancestors. The deeper subjects of the feelings, thoughts and desires of each individual therefore lie at a more enormous distance than is indicated by what it eats or what its ancestors ate. Those higher nerve organs are a result of social life, a product of the reflection effect of the social nervous system. Language, and art, that according to its being is also nothing other than an illustrated form of speaking, form the means through which the energy change in the social nervous system operates as a self driven process. This lives and causes, develops and is encouraged to differentiate of its own accord, only as a consequence of the uninterrupted realisation and new accumulation of superior energy potentials on the part of the individual and afterwards, on their part again, by virtue of the social nervous system, by self-generating reflection toward activity. The primary means through which the unified thoughts and desires of people are caused to come into being, by means of reflection, is, as we have said, language. Therefore we believe we have been justified in setting up the thesis : the person became a cultural being by means of what was spoken in the progress of the history of humanity. Therefore human culture in its entirety can be acknowledged to have just as little to do with the results of economic dynamics as it has to do with the higher elements of the individual, than it could be said to be a direct product of the materials of nourishment. One would have to maintain just the opposite of the economic life, namely at least, in so far as it concerns the level through which the individual and the social energy potentials become determined. So long as Australia was only inhabited by Australian negroes, the economic life there did not raise itself above the level of primitive people. It reached the present cultural stage only as a consequence of the psychic energies over which the European settler had control. And culture always advances according to the same manner. * —

* L. Stein, in his criticism of the organic method, when establishing the standard conditions of social dynamics, repeatedly places mechanical and chemical necessities in the position of being in the direct service of ethical imperatives. Between these standards and those of the necessities which control inorganic nature however, the magnificent zone of biological necessities lies, and on this basis acts of its own accord just in the realms of positive sociology. The latter is far removed from the desire to explain the entire social dynamics mechanically or chemically because even the simplest life processes in nature cannot be traced back exclusively to the effect of mechanical and chemical forces. Now the author says : “The imperatives of the church have shown a bias toward becoming more and more pale and doubtful, nationality has also forfeited its earlier consistency, sociology must arrange its observation in order to become a standard science, it is imperative i.e. to form a teleological type of subject” (p. 33). The social imperatives are grasped by L. Stein in his work : *The Social Question in the Light of Philosophy* (p. 705), finally brought together in the formula “Would you act so, that in each of your actions you do not simply separate your characteristics but at the same time you affirm the life of your fellow men, this applies especially however to how the future sexes should be secured and raised.” Whether this general formula could replace the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount is very questionable. But are we first of all concerned here with the question : determining such standards belongs to the task of sociology and the place of religious and moral theory is to sit down ? — The consequence of this would be that sociology would design for itself the character of a religious and moral science. There is now probably a science of religions, some scientific ethics, but religious or moral sciences would be absurdities. This designation already encapsulates within itself an internal contradiction. If the deep views of the Organicist finally arrived at the same imperatives like those of the Ten Commandments, in the Sermon on the Mount, yes, as those contained in the formula of L. Stein, it happens as such due to biological necessities, determined by the research and not in the execution of an apostle office or a moral sermon.

The necessity of purpose that this author acknowledges as a starting point for the standard by which the desires and concerns of social science can be known, for our part we note that not only human societies pursue a purpose, but rather the entire living world also pursues certain purposes. From what in this account are we to derive so special a reason that biology should not be directly translated into sociology, in the manner of a standard science. It does not simply exist to serve on and for itself, but rather when put to use in the arts, it also serves a determined purpose (hygiene, therapy, psychiatry, farming and forestry, poultry and cattle-raising, garden and fruit-growing etc.) So that before the execution of these arts would be possible, all the biological laws must first be fathomed and assessed and this is the subject matter of science. Exactly as it produces statesmanship (finance, a theory of national economics, Jurisprudence, diplomacy, militarism etc.), and there the principle of expedience in the social organism brings forward its higher nature with greater force, to which social ability must also be attached vis-à-vis a freer latitude ; but nevertheless this is linked to biological necessities and this for the reason that human society does not simply represent an ideal organization, but rather is a real organism. Because the investigation of the necessary regularity of forms is the very nature of all science, it is the direct task of sociology to fathom and to assess the biological necessities of social dynamics. In so far as sociology selects the measure of social purposes as the object of its researches it thereby loses its purely scientific character, and changes itself into a theory of statesmanship. As such then it also makes to replace moralistic claims and those of religion, as was the case with St. Simon and Aug. Comte. The Organicist does not seek on their own behalf to make any claim to be statesman. They restrict themselves to the investigation of the regularity of social dynamics. Then statesmanship may use the results of their researches to aid its previously established purpose.

Finally the following could yet be emphasized :

The organic method in sociology is no new invention. The establishment of the Christian religion brought it into use already in the same manner in its lovely parables. In that Jesus clarified his social forms ideally through examples from the living world, he gave reason to positive sociology. The same parable would only represent allegory and rhetorical figures, its effects would not have been able to be so gripping and penetrating. Jesus did not regard the physical world as an enthusiastic admirer of natural beauties, but rather to provide himself with a deep view through which to recognise that all natural forms made known their regularity and its unavoidable connection with social dynamics. This was originally intuitively recognised and Christian theology further carried out the idea in that the church was interpreted as the expanded body of Christ, an individual possessed of higher organs and gifts, where the gift of psychic energies with the greatest potential animated the real organism. We made an attempt in our “natural theology” to illuminate the parallelism between the Christian theory and the results of positive sociology along the lines discussed here. We ventured to undertake such a task from the conviction that the Christian theory can only be grasped in its full meaning and depth if it also becomes acknowledged as a representation of truth in the field of science.

We emphasized the pedagogic and educational value of the organic method in detail in our social pathology*, as well as in our graphic method in sociology**. Everyone that arrives through their schooling and upbringing at a clear consciousness of human society as a living individual, will perceive and exercise their duties that tie them to the partnership more deeply, genuinely and more comprehensively, than when they perceive the state with its hierarchical organization only represents an allegorical figure, as a unit without any real inner being. Anybody that interprets

* p. 298 and so forth.

** Bk. III *The Annals of the International Institute of Sociology*, p. 86.

social dynamics as a unified living process is bound to have a clearer presentation of what social phenomenon should be and what ability they should attain, than when they have applied themselves only to a fragmentary knowledge of sociological subjects or arrived at only one-sided views, economical, judicial or political. Also, only that statesman can be entrusted to handle the community creatively, that does not see it as an abstract concept, but rather as a real organism animated by psycho-physiological forces that cause law to come into being.

We just conducted an examination showing theologically, that the Christian church is interpreted as an expanded body of Christ and therefore as a unified organism permeated by a real living being, therefore then members of the partnership of constituent churches are more strongly joined and uniform, like the Catholic and the Greek, and are themselves more firmly and more clearly aware of their solidarity with the undivided whole than is the case with members of loosely constructed religious partnerships and members of such a state. Not just the ideal character of the Christian theory, but rather the real construction of the Christian churches also leads to this result. An idea then only receives a social value of its own accord if it delivers in itself the flesh and blood of a certain number of individuals, if it becomes incarnated in the form of the social nervous system. Each ideology must stamp itself upon higher individual energy potentials and in higher forms of social life in order to be acknowledged as a social form. Each nation for its part also pursues ideal purposes, but at the same time it represents a body, a system of mechanical, chemical, physiological and psycho-physical causal forces, and the investigation of these dynamics constitutes precisely the objective of positive sociology, whereby the organic method should serve as its reliable insight into the endlessly devouring ways of social becoming. To prove positive sociology is scientifically designed and to impress the intellectuals through scholarship and theory, the Christian theory has already been acknowledged as a truth.

The most brilliant legislators and leaders of people of all times : Lycurgus, Solon, Numa, Karl and Alfred, Peter and Frederick, as the centre of energy of the whole living collective being, felt themselves called upon to reshape it according to a newly organised, organically constituted form. They were therefore everyone, the organisers, with their nature defined according to their activity. They were the only economists, lawyers or politicians there had been, so they would be allowed to make advances unilaterally as a special cause with no statesmanlike claim to ingenuity. They had only considered the causes of the present moment and not interpreted the entire preceding evolution of the undivided whole as a real personality, as well as also the future prospects of its organic developmental properties, and so would of evoked the creation of nothing viable, but rather only fleeting events or ephemeral changes. Sociology invokes the reality of social dynamics in the clear consciousness of how since time immemorial the outstanding intellects were always set afloat unconsciously or semiconsciously. Only natural history can investigate what the material world offers you, and that has served as an object, while always recognizing what creates the individual. The teachers of organization are the present Organicists, just as the leading statesmen of all times were practical organisers.

A positive science without an objective is an absurdity. Sociology should investigate human society as an undivided whole, it must acknowledge above all the real character of the undivided whole. Sociology could be arranged as an independent science correctly, if it had not been missing the actual objective of its research for so long. Thanks to the organic method this objective, the real personality of the individual nation, is in its consciousness even if also there is only a slight number of researches applying it. With the denial of this objective sociology denies itself the status of an independent science. It can then not give us sociologists, but rather only anthropologists, ethnographers, economists, teachers of law, and cultural historians. Because however it may be that according to this state of affairs some want to devote themselves thoroughly

to being a sociologist, in latter times such hybrid sciences as Social Anthropology, Social Ethnography, Sociology of Law, Economic Sociology, Social Philosophy of History etc. have emerged. So that such intermediate disciplines are allowed to lay claim to an authorized existence, however it is the existence of a sociology with a recognition of its objectives concerned with the nation as an individual, that is above all most necessary. Those semi-sociologists however award the human state no personality, but rather grant this only to the individuals out of whom it comes to exist, and not in any case is this yet granted to the human species. At the same time they have forgotten however that each person is only a collective being that consists of cells, and that the cells for their part arise out of molecules and these out of atoms, whose constituents no scientist until now has yet been able to reveal the existence of. With just as much right as applies to the personality of the nation, one could therefore also describe the personality of the single person, even down to the negation of each cell and molecule. The denial of personality belonging to the nation as a person, has as a consequence meant that all social dynamics are interpreted only as a definition, and that the sociological terminology and classifications of social forms are traced back only to concepts. These concepts are finally acknowledged as realities and acquire the significance of idols, that Bacon designated as those impediments that block the way to every objective of research. A polemic conducted between an Organicist and such a subjective sociologist, is just as fruitless as the like kind would be between a scientist and a metaphysician. The former occupies firm ground and investigates the existence of forms relating to the simple advancing toward the convoluted. The subjective sociologist and the metaphysician float in a vacuous space on the wings of abstract concepts. The poet and the artist probably need such wings ; the researcher however must therefore always be studious not to lose the firm ground from under their feet. And for the sociologist, this firm ground is natural history. Therefore we close with the sentence, that we had conducted already at the beginning of this study : *Sociologus nemo nisi biologus*.

Commentary on the English Translation

On page forty five above, we find Lilienfeld begins by tackling the problem of an inherent dualism implied in seeking to separate sociology from biology, the question of this separation, his preface tells us, being the subject of this text. This is of course a good place to start such a discussion, but it is also naive, in that this dualism is the key to controlling knowledge in such a way that religion can act as the medium of social cohesion and power, separating science from religion in such manner as to give the appearance that the two can exist simultaneously, in harmony.

It is certainly tricky from my rendering to really know what arguments Lilienfeld is putting forward regarding the illusion of a dualism in nature. But for our purposes, where we want to think in coherent scientific terms, we would like the question of language to be brought in here, and to be made the focus of attention, whereby we see the idea of a dualism arising. Indeed there is some sense that Lilienfeld is reaching for such ideas, but he certainly does not talk about the function of language here, so his mind is still set on the idea of the individual as an integral entity existing in its own right.

Page 46 — he says the inductive method is the natural and successful method for analysing reality, but that in sociology the hypothetical or deductive are the preferred methods. In other words there is science and there is philosophy, and sociologists refuse to use science. Again, this needs a discussion of the war between religion and science, it is no good assuming people are being sincere.

This is a delightful sentence : “Human society and Nature are fixed as two entirely different spheres of existence, that meet one another, at most, only at some external point of contact.” And far more true today than it was before the Great Cleansing of 1914 – 18.

Page 47 — The purpose of all departments of science is “the establishment of the order of reality.” Yes, just so, and as he rightly says it is because of the anti-organicist infiltrator that sociology is prevented from being scientific, and of course the organicist school did not survive the Great Cleansing of 1914 – 18, so that today there is only anti-organicist sociology ! Which is not sociology at all, and it shows.

This way of thinking about insect members of superorganisms as ‘persons’ is odd, maybe I should translate this as ‘individuals’, but we do find this terminology appearing occasionally in English work. These early organicists had difficulty developing a sensible idea of the nature of the units of superorganic being, seemingly because they were confused by an obsession with human superiority.

This is a rather nice sentence : “Physiological necessity creating the cell in the single organism, has instinct stamped upon it in the animal society, and has raised itself more recently in human society causing the persons forming society to become self aware.” It chimes in sympathy with Bernard’s work, with his idea of life evolving in a series of waves of increasing complexity, centred upon the colonial, or superorganic form. Which makes sense in terms of the fact that Bernard began his study of biology under Haeckel in Jena, in 1888 ; thus we find a Germanic influence coming through in the work of an English zoologist of the period.

This is followed by the delightful observation that between an animal and a human society there is only a gradual distinction, and no distinction of any essential kind. This is an incredibly radical assertion, vastly ahead of the modern idea which makes human society a human creation.

The observation that the state is the largest expression of cooperation constituting a whole organism, is the most exasperating error of the organicist period, though it is nice to see him speculate upon the possibility of a world organism, including all humanity. We do find in one of Rene Worms' pieces, some mention of the question whether a greater union exists through the medium of religion, but Worms rejects this suggestion ! The obsession with the state really is the fatal error in an application of organicism to humans. To think the political organisation of a state represents unity, and to make this assumption when Europe is divided into a mosaic of Christian states, is truly incredible. As long as sights were set on the state as the expression of unity, science could make no headway. And yet this crude conception was vastly superior to anything we have today.

Page 48 — These categories taken from Verworn are again in sympathy with Bernard.

The paragraph in which he discusses ant and bee society, and the comparative interspatial arrangements of material, as seen between gaseous and solid states, is fabulous, a real treat to read.

Delightful : "In the contained and slave state, this association is firmer, in a free state it is looser. It gives absolute freedom however in the one, just like in the other, to few." The difference between our modern free society and an overtly slave society like that of the ancients, is minimal, one of appearance more than absolute distinction, measured in terms of real freedom of action.

Cooperation occurring between individuals is always a physiological phenomenon. Yes, this is good. But he makes animal instinct become a vague self awareness, suggesting free willed decision making in human cooperation. This absurdity is a product of his failure to recognise the biological nature of language as a medium of information dictating social structure, so that linguistic force is seen as a sequential development leading on from instinct, and applying in social orders. We cooperate by following a linguistic programme, there is no real consciousness of this arrangement, beyond the most superficial awareness.

Page 49 — This page opens with a valid attempt to make sense of the cultural dimension through which individuals are inducted into the social structure. We see the emphasis placed on the contrast between European civilisation and the primitive conditions of tribal peoples from around the world. This interest is understandable at this stage in world history, but it is a distraction. Whether primitive hunter gather or space age person, this aspect of human existence is functional. All that is relevant is the physiological mechanism of social induction, and this is simply to be understood in terms of linguistic force creating social structure, there is no need to get all elaborate about this. Commonsense should of made this logical point obvious.

This is a curious little sentence : "These higher nerve organs, the material carriers of the intellectual, ethical and aesthetic elements and capacities of the human individual, are a product of society and give society its form, they are the living source of feedback for each individual cooperating in the making of society." Again, why not simply get to grips with language as a programme ? Bernard was the same, in that he failed to get any sense of language as a detached medium of information over which individuals had no control, so that people belong to language rather language belonging to people.

Page 50 — Here we find an elaborate and extensive invocation of the mere power of the voice to impart a great explosive result, this is a good representation of the idea of linguistic force creating social structure, or disorder, but we find no indication that he recognised in language, the presence of an organic force. As we usually say, perhaps in the age of genetics and computers we are so empowered to find the idea of a linguistic programme creating social structure plausible, that we cannot appreciate how alien and unreachable such an idea was in Lilienfeld's time.

Toward the end of this page we find some moralising drivel about the essence of culture being invoked when it stimulates the individual in a morally superior fashion. This is pure religious gush, anathema to science. This idea is the basis of the notion of civilisation, which is all very well, but the fact is that although we dress it up in language designed to disguise the malignancy of civilisation's effects on life, even so, the negative facets of civilised life are just as real and ongoing as the much vaunted higher achievements, and science must therefore account for all aspects equally, in functional, not moral terms.

Page 51 — Here we find a vindication of the analogical approach which got organicists into a lot of trouble, in terms of bringing their science into disrepute. Here Lilienfeld sounds moderate and reasonable, but no matter how reasonable an analogical approach to sociology might be, based on a comparison of somatic physiology and social physiology, the resulting comparisons are bound to leave one vulnerable to the malicious intent of the priests who rule academia. We never feel the need to pursue such analogies. This is mainly due to the fact that we have a solid conception of society as a living order created by nature, via the physiological creation of a linguistic force, by evolving linguistic physiology. With linguistic force rooted in individual physiology, whereby we see religion as an identity programme unifying individuals, there is no need to toy with crude notions of cells compared directly with people.

Page 52 — This discussion of terminology is still relevant today, sociology being like philosophy in its ability to proliferate jargon, and its inability to develop fixed terminology accepted across the board because it is fixed on definite material elements. I use the word 'reflection' because that is what Lilienfeld used, it appears in works by his contemporaries, such as Novicow, if I remember rightly, but it is vague and I do not really know what it means, as it is too much like jargon and not enough like reality. Again, we fix on the term 'linguistic force', which is easy to work with and relates to definite realities.

Page 53 — This line is quite nice : "The inert capital, as a portion of the intercellular substance, only represents an extension of the psycho-physiological energies accumulated in persons." It seems a bit obscure, but taken in the context of the containing paragraph, we find we are talking about what we call the 'exoskeleton of the superorganism', which Lilienfeld calls 'intercellular substance'. His idea is weaker than ours because it fails to recognise the superorganism as the only real entity, and instead allows the individual some 'end in themselves' status. Even so, this description of our 'artificial' world as nothing more than an extension of individual physiological attributes is very nice, it would be better if he introduced the idea of linguistic force emanating from individual physiology, being responsible for the generation of such intercellular substance. And he concludes with a nicely dismissive rejection of priestly drivel as meaningless ripples through the corridors of academia. Sadly these were 'ripples of power', and they erased his genuine scientific ideas, leaving us struggling to recover science today, as we endure a vicious and primitive world power, living under the abuse of an absolute theocracy, as ever.

The discussion leading up to the mention of "the central socio-embryological law" strains the power of machine translation to its limit. But the effort Lilienfeld exerts here, to make sense of social evolution, is such that we cannot skip our lame effort to understand his work just because it comes up against complex philosophical ideas. We must at least note that earlier he had indicated the need for sociology to use the inductive scientific method to produce sociological laws, working consecutively with those identified in biology, (p. 46.) and he is trying to do just that here. Really, we tackle this issue by thinking of life as information, and linguistic programmes creating social structure as an extension of genetic programmes producing organisms, such that we find some emulation of our reasoning as regards linguistic force, emerging in Lilienfeld's expression of this

primary socio-embryological law. As ever though, these comparisons only serve to show the extraordinary limitation of the scientific community prior to the Great Cleansing of 1914 – 18, in their inability to make the leap toward thinking of humans as strictly material elements, bereft of individual meaning, despite the fact that this is precisely what these great scientists seemed to be striving to do.

We can see what he is trying to get a grip on when he talks about a modern child being equipped with powers equal to that of an adult of former times, but this is a crude and fanciful idea. As we can see from our own general thesis, while knowledge advances enormously, yet the individual remains stationary. The implanted slave knowledge is more sophisticated, but it remains as false, and hence primitive, as ever any idea could be. No idea possessed by humanity was ever more primitive and ignorant than that which we all worship today under the name of Darwin, and this because Darwinism is quite simply a farcical deception.

Page 54 — The discussion of social evolution offered here looks detailed, and this breaches the capacity of machine translation to do justice to the argument, we must remain tantalised by the ideas—placed before us here—yet lying just beyond our full grasp.

The same observation applies, if less critically, to the passage reaching across to the next page, where he expounds upon the unity of human kind and the reasons for diversity ; mainly being due to the effects of social conditioning, as seen through the array of languages. For our purposes the main point of importance in this passage, is the implicit recognition of a biological human nature, a most important fact to be clear about, and, for Lilienfeld, an idea upon which the hope for a future unification of all peoples relies. Once again it is surprising that people do not see fit to make this point about the existence of a biological human nature explicit, today of course, science explicitly denies that there is any such thing, a necessary lie in order to sustain the absurd notion that individuals are human beings, rather just ‘sentient bricks’ evolved to bring a mammalian superorganism into being at the level of social organisation.

Page 55 — It is good to see Lilienfeld condemning Spencer’s sociological theorising, especially regarding Spencer’s later work. We see the same condemnation made by Morley Roberts and others, and this is important because Spencer is the main voice of English organicism, according to modern academics. The only significant treatise on the organicist school, by Coker, 1910, begins its review of Lilienfeld by questioning whether Lilienfeld had heard of Spencer’s early works, so it is useful to see that Lilienfeld rejects Spencer as a fraud.

This sentence : “He surveyed almost the entirety of social life’s unifying factors, and considered only the autonomy of the individual.”, says it all ! This is precisely the way science works today, as documentaries discuss the use of language, *Horizon* on BBC 2, November 2009 for example, admitting that it is an evolved attribute, but one that had no purpose until humans figured out a use for it !!

The ensuing reply to Stein’s critique of organicism looks interesting enough. Reading my own translation I am not able to go back to the original work and redo it, and this is the first point at which I lose all track of the argument, because I translate Stein as making expediency the priority in social life, that Lilienfeld accepts along with some other, *unnamed* factor. However, at the bottom of the page, Lilienfeld says expediency becomes a feature of an artistic approach, as contrasted with a scientific method, or so it seems to say, and if so, then we recover the gap, as Stein is thereby made to contrast science with expediency. And this would make sense in an anti-organicist work, where ‘expediency’ can be interpreted as a subtle reference to the free will of human decision makers, as opposed to the operation of mechanical imperatives. That said, I would be inclined to think of expediency as an alternative way to describe a ‘functional imperative’.

This passage on Stein could therefore do with a better translation to make much of it, but it is still nice content, which becomes rather curious when we come to a mathematical formulation, which I could only try to represent in the least garbled fashion, for the sake of completeness, with no pretence to accurate representation of what was actually first stated, which I would probably not have made sense of even if it had been translated for me by a bilingual speaker of English and German. But, saying that, we get a pleasing hint as to the nature of the theoretical exercise, when he concludes by saying that the ultimate expression of the mathematical formula, would find man and god becoming as one. We might call on our recognition that the word 'God' in fact refers to the superorganism, as a real entity, and therefore what we call 'man', and what we call 'God', *can* be unified through the medium of scientific sociology, properly conducted.

Page 57 — This begins with some mention of the Christian as an example of social order, indicating that our view of the Christian as the slave of the Jews, is a million miles away from how this organicist hero of ours looks at these things, which goes to show how useless Lilienfeld and all his kind really were, as if we did not already know it. *Religion is the key to knowledge, in that religion is the barrier to all true knowledge.*

The discussion of sociology as an independent science, rooted in the organic foundations of biology is good, as far as it goes. But the real reason why society must be regarded as a living organism, is that humans are made by nature to form society, therefore, the only valid scientific point of view that is possible, is that : *society is made by nature*. As such, sociology must be a branch of biology : the science of life. This is similar to making nuclear physics a branch of physics, where the subject matter of nuclear physics is nonetheless so far removed from the physics of everyday life, that the two subjects really have nothing in common whatsoever, to all appearances. Yet the connection exists, because the subatomic world underpins the material world we move within. Likewise, the ability to develop social life as we do, is rooted in the infinitesimally small aspects of life, such as the genetic fabric. This latter point cannot be seen however, because seeing it interferes with the very means by which we make society through the medium of knowledge. The question then is, Can we advance to the point where we are able to see the truth, and still make a modern society work on that basis ? It is a question without an answer, so far I cannot even find any way to ask others to join me in answering the question, and this question requires a practical proof, that can only be answered by action that makes it so. But the first stage in generating this proof, is to get people to join in the effort to construct an answer.

Bridging onto the next page, we find a discussion of the grand individual as a focal point of history. This topic was a favourite of the enemies of organicism—being a representation of the individual as an end in themselves—and today the celebrity figurehead is a crucial element in the illusion of an individual as an end in themselves. Where we 'nonexistent individuals'—because we are unknowns—take our meaning from life vicariously, by following the life events of the celebrity. All of this should be made sense of by developing basic scientific principles, somewhat like Lilienfeld says he desires for sociology, but fails to conceive of in any meaningful form. The first major rule of organicism that anyone needs to be clear about is : *there is no such thing as an individual*. We can fill out this rule by adding 'as an end in themselves', but the rule simply stated tells us that individuals do not exist, end of story. Really, when we think about it, this rule should be an assumption for sociology, otherwise, What is sociology ? It should instead be called the science of individuality, which is not what it is. Indeed, there is no such thing as a science of individuality, Why would there be ? Yet that is what sociology is in practice.

We would use this rule of superorganic physiology to explain the notable historical figure of the celebrated personality, as a functional element within the superorganic form. This is easy to do, as human superorganisms evolve in complexity, taking on the supermassive civilised form, the individual becomes alienated from the core being of the resulting superorganism. This

requires a cultural development to re-establish the links between the core hub of the superorganism, and the increasing mass of disenfranchised individuals, who have no part in the core dynamic of the organism. This explains why people yearn for celebrities with whom they can enjoy a sense of sympathy, giving them the sense of belonging in society that we need, by virtue of our biological human nature, that evolved to bring a superorganism into being at the level of social organisation.

The historical figure that implements the social dynamic is more than a regular celebrity, although a Napoleon or a Nelson also carry the mark of celebrity status. These people give the biological imperative at the core of the human superorganism, telling it to grow and expand, a personal face. This is why we speak of political figures as 'face men'. These people always emerge at just the time when they are needed. Napoleon came soon after the French Revolution, his real role was to re-establish the absolute theocracy that the revolution had destroyed, and this is what he did. A 'Napoleon' had to appear at this time, if he had been called 'Bob', 'Sue' or 'Sid', it would of made no odds, the same type of dictatorial, militaristic figure, would of come forward and done exactly what Napoleon did, this is a physiological process, that has nothing to do with personalities, history, ambition, good and evil, etc. etc. We have made the exact same observation regarding Hitler, his rise was essential to the preservation of the Jews, and indeed this whole notion of the time being right, is fundamental to the idea that science has been destroyed, and the world wars were about cleansing society and returning Europe to enslavement to Judaism, by smashing the social fabric and injecting a new Jewish slave identity in the form of Islam. The social infrastructure is a machine that appoints its face men, when dead head like Bush was needed to go to war in Iraq, he came to power ; now the world needs soothing we get a black president in America. It is all driven by the *machine*, as an expression of superorganic physiology. The underlying fabric of superorganic being is dictated by biology, it emerges into a cultural form through religion, then politics, and it finds expression in history, which must appear in a form that we individuals can understand. This scenario is akin to thinking about the hierarchy of informational codes that raise the computer from an inert lump of matter, into a machine capable of acting as an extension of our brains. This is achieved by a series of transitions including hardware arrangements, machine code, programming code and finally software written in a human interfacing language.

It is obvious from the way Lilienfeld talks about these matters that his general outlook is in great harmony with a true scientific view such as we offer, but that he simply has no idea how to think in a sufficiently detached manner, about humans as material entities. He talks about the variety of academics interfering in sociology, that denounce organicism because they have no idea what biology is, but here we find he has no idea what biology is. And besides, this style of defence indicates a flaw in his reasoning, that makes us think of him in terms of the gatekeeper syndrome, whereby a person adopts a position antagonistic to religion, in order to protect religion from an otherwise potentially fatal attack. The reason why people who stand against organicism do so, is simply because of the eternal war between religion and science, and this is the only issue that any defender of the organic method in sociology need take on board. Get rid of religion and all will be revealed, fail to destroy religion, and science must be doomed to non-existence.

Page 58 — The discussion of static and dynamic divisions in sociology is of historical interest, especially since Lilienfeld sees this artificial division as creating much confusion, however we would need an extensive discussion of this topic for it to be of any real use. We get a hint as to the significance of this division when he tells us that institutions are deemed 'static' elements of social order, but this is so far away from our approach that these models derived from Comte, Spencer and others, like Ward, are of no immediate interest to ourselves. But in general terms we might say that the focus upon such a division did distract generations of organicists away from what really matter, which was the topic of linguistic force and religion. Yet religion

could of been seen as a static expression of superorganic physiology generated by the dynamic impress of linguistic force, so this division could have been fruitful.

Page 59 — Strange that he thinks the prehistoric period was shorter than the historic ! Surely they knew better than this by 1898. And we find more puerile eulogising of Christ, where what we want is pure atheism, denigrating Christianity as a nasty, degrading, slave identity.

His moralising about the state of the world is all very well, but without any true grasp of the nature of humans as a superorganic mammal, this amounts to nothing more than the usual religious bunkum. This invocation is a little odd : “the future cultural historian will design for themselves a measuring stick made possible by the sociology of the personal values of the individual, and show how the progress and dimensions of the collective whole was reached by this means.” It certainly conflicts with the primary rule of organicism that tells us there is no such thing as an individual, and it does this so forcefully as to suggest the exact opposite, that the individual is all and the social form is a product of their conscious will power. This, if we understand him correctly, is anathema to organicist sociology.

We could however imagine that what is meant, is that society generates rules that cause the individual to become ever more civilised, and so, by means of developing personal values, imposed by the life of the superorganism, social progress occurs. This interpretation says the same thing, but from a different standpoint that denies the person any role in their progressive transformation, which is closer to reality. It is evident that Lilienfeld was a moralistic philosopher, in the traditional style of the religious priest, so we only find a place in our heart for this man because he is the sole acknowledged exponent of human society as a true living organism.

Given the limited sense he has of the prehistoric time span, it is odd to see him deriding the myopia of intellectuals regarding the real scale of natural events. This is a most important point, as such it is good to see it considered, but we wonder what his grasp of these matters was.

Page 60 — This discussion of two opposing philosophical views of organicism, the materialists versus the idealist, requires a perfect translation to appreciate. It boils down to the materialist’s anti-materialist assertion that psychic phenomena are a new force, entirely unique to humans and detached from material nature. This is reminiscent of Bernard, except Bernard sought to project the psychic dimension back through all nature. As ever, all we want to say when such subjects arise, is that this is the time when language should be brought into view. What is called ‘psychic’ is nothing other than what we recognise as linguistic force, derived from human linguistic physiology, intended to project physiology onto the level of superorganic being. But we can see why Bernard slipped up in his use of his psychic model, when we see this kind of discussion above. A 1911 review of *Neglected Factors* found Bernard’s notion of telepathy ridiculous, and so do we, but these priests love to have their cake and eat, they condemn Bernard, but they leave others who rant on about psychic forces alone.

Bridging onto the next page, the translation is a little obscure. The theme could be said to concern the evaluation of the comparative force of life, expressed in the superorganism as compared to that which can be given expression via the individual. This subject is a valid topic of discussion, where we say there is no such thing as an individual, hence the balance of force lying toward the social entity, and Lilienfeld’s ideas also indicate that human power lies within the body of the superorganism, not that of the person.

The reference to the church serving as a model of Christ’s body is of interest, it is a theme I have seen recounted on a documentary about Durham Cathedral, where the proportions of the structure encoded the Christian theology’s representation of Christ’s body. More than this however, we find the Jewish identity programme, of which Christianity is one extension, to be a

codification of the real existence of the superorganism, from whence Judaism derives its real power, by accreting linguistic force to itself on intuitive principles. This leads to the idea that 'God' refers to the 'superorganism', and as such we find the proof that God does not exist, by discovering what God really is. This passage above puts us in mind of these ideas, and we must wonder how the world failed to see this blindingly obvious connection, which would of destroyed civilisation in the twinkling of eye — wait a minute, could that be why . . . ?

Page 61 — It is legitimate to deal with so pervasive an idea as that of the 'soul' from a scientific point of view, once one has a scientific model capable of handling such a subject. We would say the fact that we do not exist, means that we take our sense of existence from the superorganism of which we form a miniscule part, and this deposit of 'self', implanted into us, that is not of the 'self' at all, is the 'soul', so called. Further down the page he says the body is a society of cells, and therefore the soul is dispersed throughout the body, existing in every cell. Clearly this conception of the soul is wholly different to ours, but it is closer to the ideas expressed by Bernard and others of the period, who were enamoured of ideas like this, concerning the notion of a psychic force imbued into living matter. This psychic force is simply an intuitive recognition of the fundamental essence of life, which is information. Clearly the information leading to the idea of the soul is linguistic, not genetic, concerning the place of the individual within the physiology of the superorganism, and as such Lilienfeld's idea is absurd.

The following discussion of the nature of consciousness is quite delightful, but not surprisingly, it fails to take us anywhere decisive. We do appear to have a very clear description of a 'social programme', contained within the social matrix, directing the behaviour of all individuals, in a uniform manner. We cannot better this, as far as it goes, but it does not make the final leap, and realise the nature and function of language relative to this programme, which he simply calls a "collective consciousness", which is all very well, but not very incisive. It is easy to see how the idea of a genetic code, a genome delivering species form, would be a godsend here.

This is a remarkable passage : "Most cellular elements of society behave according to an entirely instinctive or semiconscious programme. Even in the higher cultural state, it is always only a vanishingly small minority that is completely aware of the harmonisation of the living whole. Actually, in the normal state of existence the government must, as the central organ of the social nervous system, include this minority within itself."

This is exasperatingly good, because it is all here, and yet, still, we are nowhere. Most people are units, driven by a programme — yes !

This unwitting obedience to a biological programme created by nature reaches right the way to the top of the social order — yes !

There exists a tiny nugget of supremely elite individuals, that alone possess complete knowledge of reality ; alas — if only !

These portions of Lilienfeld's argument reveal the limits of his grasp of the meaning of a truly scientific sociology. Here we see the naive adherence to a primitive conception of civilised life, that any truly scientific conception of life simply cannot sustain. That is not to say that we are not driven to think along these lines continuously, because we are, it is in the nature of the creatures that we are. But this idea of a sacred few is essentially religious, and not at all scientific. Certainly science must address the question of social elites and the ordering of society, and from whence the higher order derives that is an obvious feature of our world. But this explanation must derive from the concept of linguistic force creating superorganic physiology. Just as the genome creates life that preserves the genome that creates the living form, so the linguistic programme creates a social order, that preserves the linguistic programme that creates the social form. Therefore, it follows, that, as amazing as it may seem to us, there need be no

one, anywhere, who has the faintest idea what on earth is going on, even if they are the ultimate repository of social power.

We do in fact see that Lilienfeld's idea incorporates the recognition that wisdom is far from being at one with power, and it is for this reason that he assumes that the repository of ultimate wisdom that must exist, as he evidently thought, need not always be found where it naturally belongs, in the enclaves of social power. And no doubt it is from peculiar and puerile ideas like this, that Lilienfeld felt driven to focus on notions of social pathology, as we know he did, because he published a work in French bearing such a title, as indicated above.

This is where the idea of a linguistic force creating social structure comes into its own. Once we have our ideas focused on religion, we recognise that as the institutions of religious order induct individuals into their framework of social power, training them in the demands of the religious programme, it is apparent that all that is required is done, where the religious programme, once evolved, only need find individuals serve it. Then, hey presto, the result we see in Judaism is a foregone conclusion, where a scabby bunch of nobodies come from nowhere, and from a world of nothing special, and in the twinkling of an eye, a mere six millennia, they consume the entire biomass of the earth, and rule the planet ! And as a result bring a superorganism into being of so incredible a form as to be quite staggeringly fabulous, it must be said, for all that we despise the religious means delivering this strange end. The Jewish programme is full of direct statements acknowledging what 'must be known', such as the famous idea of the 'Chosen', but there is no reason why anyone should know what these things *really mean*. When the new world was discovered by the Spanish it was necessary for the master race to take possession of these new territories in person, it was no good just sending their slaves, the Christians, out there. Christians, it seems, like Muslims, we must assume, cannot function without a quotient of master elements dispersed amongst them, to farm them : *and someone must know this*. So the Pope instructed the institution of a pogrom, forcing the Jews to leave Spain and head for South America. This is not how history tells the story, it is how I view it since discovering the true nature of humans. And this particular event, which cannot be a coincidence, and which required a deliberate act on the part of the head of the Jewish slave body, is the closest I can come to a proof of their being a body of people who do indeed know just what Judaism means, and what its real biological function is. Yet even so, all that is needed is a codification of reality in mythological form, reality need not be known in itself.

The way we have come to handle the history of science as subverted by Darwin is redolent with the imputation of such a body of elite 'know alls', seeing where intellectual developments were going, and knowing where they must be led, and hence Darwin was trained up and made the main 'face man' of science. But unlike the expulsion of Jews from Spain in the seventeenth century, the fabrication of Darwin as a scientist, is not quite so clear cut. Although, amazingly, the history of his story does indeed show him to of been selected by an elite at the heart of social power, and then pushed toward the destiny his masters had chosen for him.

There can be no doubt that the subversion of science over the course of the last one and a half centuries involved a great deal of highly knowledgeable people, right at the core of the social order, and continues to do so, who have been crucial to the achievement of the continuance of a Jewish mastery of the earth. These people are however ordinary men and women, committed to the Jewish programme by what is called their 'faith', dedicated to the established order as they know it, without knowing its higher biological aim, and this is all that is required to meet the terms of existence of the 'mystical body' that Lilienfeld imagines exists here.

Page 62 — I am not inspired by his psychological discussion of the individual, said to shed light on the nature of the collective consciousness—I do not think so. Nor does his excursion in the land of Marxism interest me much, except, in the course of this journey, he visits the Americas and refers to the eradication of the primitive native culture due to the ingress of the

Jews, and discusses the dynamics of this replacement process in terms of an advanced culture's accumulated social powers. All this is very interesting, as a start, but his handling of the analysis is unbelievably pathetic. Where do we see the logic of the idea that society is a real superorganism, entering into this description of the consumption of a lesser social organism by a greater one ? The problem is clearly that Lilienfeld is consumed with the idea of the individual as a real entity. This is no good, we are obliged to lose ourselves if we would know who we are.

Page 63 — This is a superb statement : “The isolated thought of the individual has neither social nor yet historical value, it receives this value only to the extent that it is transmitted in the words, writing, and artwork proclaimed by other people, by this means it acquires flesh and blood, due to the reflection effect it is taken into the nervous systems of other individuals and in this way becomes the common property of the social nervous system of a nationality, a religious partnership, or the whole of humanity.”

No sooner are we done slamming the man for failing to develop the implications of this primary declaration regarding the nature of human nature, and he comes out with a categorical statement of exactly the kind we desire to see. But the problem remains critical if, when it comes to the application of the scientifically inspired principles to real life events, historical or otherwise, he simply fails to apply the logic as determined in theory. Again we see him deferring to Christianity as something to be valued, thereby completely failing to understand what his own observations really mean. The recording of the laws of Moses for deliverance to the world is a good subject to select as a means of talking about how linguistic force develops a programme that can build a superorganic physiology. So we have a partial recognition of the crucial factor regarding the nature of social exchange, in that he says ideas have no meaning unless they are part of a social flux. But we do not get a logical follow up of this observation, to reveal that this means there is no such thing as an individual, and all that really exists is the fabric of the superorganic being, wherein these social representations of ideas, such as the laws of Moses, act as a means of inducting the individual into the biomass of the superorganism. From this model we could recognise that the American Indians were consumed by the ingress of the Jewish culture, and thus replaced, because the Jewish culture was a linguistic programme empowering a superorganism according to a far more powerful structural formula, against which the native Americans were powerless. This would describe everyday human experience in terms of the concept of the superorganism, in such a way that anyone could understand it, where one advanced social organism meets a more juvenile form, and simply consumes it ; but this he does not give us.

So, in conclusion, referring back to the above quote, there are no such things as the ‘thoughts of an individual’. In reality all our thoughts are derived from the superorganism, so there is no question of our individual ideas having no value, *all* ideas have value because they are drawn from the information flux contained within the physiology of the living superorganism, of which we are a unitary part. Any ideas originating in individuals are spurious, of no consequence, being discarded as soon as they are fired off, from the perspective of the sociologist at least.

Where he says “Personalities represent cellular elements in the relevant social nervous systems.” We must acknowledge the effort, but dismiss the product. We have already noted that personalities are ‘face men’, selected and manufactured by the physiology of the superorganism, to give a medium of representation for the underlying physiological machine. As such personalities cannot represent cellular elements, that would be to validate the existence of individuals as ends in themselves. On the contrary then, these personalities represent the core organ of superorganic being, which is really the machinery produced by linguistic force that exists in the shape of the religious identity programme, that is the essence of the superorganism. Here then we find

Lilienfeld serving a highly functional role with an absolute theocracy, by promoting the exact idea of the special person that the special person is meant to be, according to the linguistic programme emanating from the core authority of the superorganism. Once again then, this most forthright exponent of the most deadly idea facing religious power, turns out to be a Gatekeeper of the Theocracy, just like all other major enemies of religion that we know of, people like Darwin, Bertrand Russell, Dawkins and so on.

We can use this example : “However this mainly happened only by way of the social reflection effect.” of my effort at translation, to discuss what I still recall was the most exasperating nuance of the whole job, the rendering of the meaning of the ‘social reflection effect’. For the life of me I could not convert this into an English phrase, and here we find a good of example of my failure to make sense of this. The immediately preceding use of this idea of ‘social reflection’, gives us something to go at, in terms of trying to understand what he was getting at. It seems to refer to the ‘effect of social influence’. I could of rendered this as the ‘social influence effect’ perhaps, but I am sure this is still inadequate. The kernel of what he is driving at is however a central part of our reasoning, in that we regard the individual as being commanded, unwittingly, to behave in obedience to the linguistic programme that is the cultural flux, existing within the social matrix. So if we cannot quite grasp an adequate translation of the phrase, we can certainly be confident that we can make sense of the general idea he is using here, within the overall organicist agenda that our man is delivering, that we are seeking to resurrect, and modernise.

Bearing in mind that we characterise our work as ‘atheist science’, phrases such as : “Only the highest of all persons can serve as an object of culture, and such Christ was.” do not ingratiate Lilienfeld to us. Small wonder that this greatest of all Organicists should of achieved nothing, and left behind work that, while intriguing and a delight to find, fails to meet our expectations as either atheists or would be scientists.

Bridging onto the next page we have this discussion of language : “The word is always the carrier of intellectual, religious, ethical, aesthetic, also the economic, legal and hierarchical-political reflection effects already in the primitive partnership of people ; being gradually included in the progress of history : through the education of the higher social nerve organs in the person and in society, by always accumulating higher psychic energies in the individual and the social nervous systems, they become flesh.”

The sentiment expressed here is not so far removed from the idea of linguistic force creating social structure. But there is nonetheless a huge chasm between Lilienfeld’s use of such insights, and ours. Again we find him ending his argument in a vindication of Christianity, so much so that he indicates that his whole object is to accommodate sociology to religion. As we have already said in this commentary, atheist science does accommodate science to religion by discovering what religion is as a natural phenomenon, and this is tantamount to achieving the accommodation that Lilienfeld values, except he evidently wanted to preserve religion thereby, while we want to eradicate religion by the same means of *accommodation*. Clearly it is not possible for science and religion to exist in the same society, at one and the same time. Lilienfeld’s ideas seem to suggest this might be possible, but I cannot imagine how he would make this argument, it would be nice to see his fifth volume to look for his ideas in greater elaboration, sadly, the only copy I ever found, was sent from Vienna by cheapo idiot post, and never arrived at my door—misery of miseries.

Page 64 — This sentence : “Economic progress therefore leads to the conveyance of selfish drives in social life, becoming a mechanism acting increasingly on its behalf.” again reinforces the reality, and ever increasing possibility, of the individual existing as an end in

themselves. We cannot let it pass therefore. Economic inequality is a reflection of the inherent nature of any life form's physiology, which must always be hierarchical in its nature. Therefore the reinforcing of individuality is an artefact of the delineation of a hierarchical social physiology, in which the individual does not exist (as an end in themselves.) If he had established the primary principle of sociology, that *the individual does not exist*, he could not have made such a ludicrous mistake. The increase of individuality would be seen for what it is : a manifestation of the biological urge to produce an elite order, serving as the substance of a master organ, vital to the existence of a human superorganism. This results in people like Margaret Thatcher famously declaring there is no such thing as society—a total inversion of reality—and the concomitant blind pursuit of power vested in as few individuals as possible. But that is how a superorganism must be formed, it does not mean that the linguistic devices, the statements of politicians, used to represent these outcomes, are real representations of reality, far from it.

Lilienfeld does not wish to vindicate exploitation, he proceeds to validate the most un-Darwinian of human characteristics, 'altruism'. This affirms his religious impulse, and negates his scientific pretensions. I cannot quite see what his justification is for saying that the organicist view of society validates altruism, the translation is not up to this task. But we can imagine how the way he handles the organicist idea, as a means of developing higher human values that are then passed on to individuals, via an accumulative effect, would support some such religious type of nonsense. Once we have the idea in place that individuals do not exist, then the very idea of altruism becomes null and void, since the modern idea of self interest in helping those who are genetically related to us, becomes a weak expression of the true position, where we are in fact parts of one animal. The homosexual exemplifies this position, where they have actually evolved to be a new kind of human, entirely dependant upon the goodwill of others for their existence, since the homosexual cannot, by definition, reproduce themselves. But they repay this sacrifice of the majority, by becoming the natural masters of the world, existing to make us all their slaves, which is the thing we love being, more than anything else. Now, why could Lilienfeld not say something like that when talking about Christianity ?

He wants to build castles in the sky, we want reality. He says the more refined the idea the more it dominates the material dimension of social life. This must be meant to indicate how Christianity makes people live for others, in honour of a higher ideal. But the truth is that this identity programme is a slave programme, it is as vicious, evil and ignorant as any idea could be, which is why it is so powerful. The basic parameters of any linguistic programme giving a formula for the production of a human superorganism, is the definition of the insider versus the outsider. Christianity excludes people in the most vicious manner, seeking the ethnic cleansing of all who are not slaves of the Jews. It follows that it will act equally intensely in the opposite polar expression of human nature, hence love is the primary command of the Christian, expressed through charity, self sacrifice and such like. But this is only for the insider, the exact opposite expression has been reserved for the outsider, although, now the Jews have taken possession of all humanity, there are no longer any outsiders remaining, and hence we live in a multicultural world, where all are to be treated as insiders. But, the point is, there is no 'higher ideal' operating here, other than the more refined power of the linguistic programme to produce an unwittingly enslaved individual, utterly bereft of any power to resist abuse, because they, like a slave ant, have no means of knowing they do not exist, and that their true nature is that of a slave of an alien form, of a like kind. Under these circumstances the moronic human acts according to the highest values, sacrificing itself for its fellows, without having the slightest notion what this programming running in its brain, dictating this behaviour, really means in terms of the physical reality of its being. When Lilienfeld talks about individuals being driven by social reflection effects, this is what his ideas are really referring to, though he apparently has no idea this is so.

The phrase “psycho-physiological” appears here and there, but it just occurred to me to pick it out here, and note that this is close to the idea of linguistic force generating social structure. Lilienfeld handles this quite differently, trying to load it with values, even though, just here, he is saying that acting as scientists, it is important not to forget the naturalistic parameters of the subject. For him the psycho physiological duality is just that, some kind of interdependent process. But we take this idea to its most perfect expression when we make language the true expression of the psychic idea, and the physiology of speech the physical origin of this linguistic phenomenon. Thus we combine the “psycho-physiological” as perfectly as one might combine the written word, with the meaning it relates to the literate person.

Bridging onto the next page we have this : “. . . there are no general laws in the scientific sense, that can be given for society coming into being. This statement, that must immediately be acknowledged as logically untenable, was already factually refuted on behalf of the Organicist by the determination of an entire series of positive laws that are jointly applicable to social life and all living nature.”

Excusing myself for the cack-handed translation, I think we get the point. I do not try to turn this kind of statement into English intuitively, off the top of my head, since that would lose the sense of some of the original words, such as I have laboriously dug out of old dictionaries. Alls well as long as we can read it as if a foreigner were addressing us who spoke fair English, but not quite right, the way foreigners do, by using strange grammar and inappropriate words—as if they had swallowed a dictionary—that nonetheless allows us to understand their intended meaning. I think the imperfect product of this method will keep us closer to Lilienfeld, than if I seek to create an English version according to my own mode of expression.

So in the above quote, we have the most emphatic insistence that natural laws apply to human society. That a society once existed on the face of the earth, in which such ideas could be understood and touted openly, is truly incredible. And to think, my father’s father, a deeply religious man, born a bastard and forever oppressed by the degradation of it, was four years old when this book was printed—its not exactly a lost civilisation is it ? Well yes, actually, it is. Living in a primitive world where ignorance stalks us at every quarter, where such astounding knowledge as this is utterly forbidden, by the most severe penalties of exclusion and rebuke, at the very least, this is heaven sent material. Imagine having been taught this in junior school !! The world would have to be a very different place indeed, one where freedom reigned, and life were something to enjoy, instead of bemoaning and living for the sole purpose of seeking out some means to destroy the scum that rule us, own us, farm us and generally screw us anyway they can.

Page 65 — This discussion is essentially that of the analogical method, where people like Spencer likened telegraph wires to nerves, and earned himself ridicule accordingly. Lilienfeld has already dealt with this question of analogical reasoning, but we find ourselves being drawn back into it here. It only becomes worth taking notice of as he starts to discuss the analogy between solar systems, versus that of political orders. He shows himself up here, badly. Once again we find him misjudging the nature of conflict within human society, as he did when he saw capitalism as a promotion of individuality at the expense of altruism. His perspective is that of the politician, the person who knows nothing, except the detail of life as we live it, taken at face value. The correction we applied in the case just named must be the same here, it is a matter of understanding the nature of the social being, and just as we noted that there was no such thing as an individual, so now we must see that there is a structural hierarchy. Internecine conflict between levels of the social hierarchy are not a contradiction of the organicist principle of organic unity, these dynamics are part of a normal healthy physiological process, occurring on route to the stabilisation of hierarchical orders. Conflict is not a political process, and its

representation as such, is part of the identity programme inducting us into the matrix of the superorganism. Logic tells us that for such hierarchical orders to be formed, there must be change, and for change to occur, there must be bouts of *conflict* in an orderly system : periods of demolition, in the work of construction.

Where we have this sentence : “The people who felt their mind was torn in two directions belonged simultaneously to two different social nervous systems, whose activities did not occupy a position of unanimous agreement and where there was also temporarily a state of open warfare between the two.” we find a concurrence with our reasoning on the subject of racial hatred as a vital feature of social order, as discussed in *The Colonial Ape*, posted to Scribd recently. Lilienfeld is trying to make sense of such internal conflict, and doing so by basing his reasoning on the frailties of the individual. This is a gross error. These conflicts produce tension that generates bonds between segments of the superorganism, that would otherwise drift apart, coalescing into their own enclaves of authority and identity. Without conflict therefore, the core nature of human animals would be lost to us, and indeed this tendency to spiral into isolation is what gave rise to racial diversification. So what we have in mind here is the idea of a force of human nature that can shift toward both insularity and expansion, and in both cases the mediatory dynamic is conflict, which excludes in the one case and binds in the other. Such alternating dynamics occur in all dynamic systems, and as such we would expect to identify them in human superorganic social systems.

He concludes section one with some discussion of revolving social dynamics, that seems to chime with the observations we have just made. It would certainly be nice to have an accurate rendition of this work.

Page 66 — This section two is very nice, a discussion of merging superorganisms is of the greatest interest. However he misses the golden opportunity presented by this discussion. He says that he has not forgotten the ethical factor involved in the unification process, whereby we may imagine he has in mind the Christianising of heathen societies, but he leaves this as an aside. This is where he had an opportunity to discuss the role of an identity programme serving as a binding agent for a globalising superorganism, advanced by means of conflict such as he names, but all the while acting in obedience to the core identity, namely Judaism. How did he miss this ? It is so blindingly obvious that Christianity must be the slave identity of Judaism, and Islam likewise. We see all the pieces to this puzzle lying before the man, and we wonder why he failed to put them together.

This is a sheer delight : —

“A population that completely lost a conscious sense of its unified status would no longer have an organic form, but rather only exist as a contiguous form, exactly like the trees of a forest and the grass blades of a meadow. Such a society has ceased to exist as a concrete organism ; it has decomposed into its individual components ; it forms only a discrete collection.”

This is practically the most perfect scientific statement any human being could ever make. Made in this form it is negative, and as such useless to all except those who know what its true significance is, and that its motive force needs to be inverted to give this statement its true significance. For what we have here is a declaration that a human superorganism is formed by means of a shared identity, lose that identity, and the superorganism is dead. This idea is the essence of understanding the nature of human society and all that takes place within it. It tells us what Judaism is all about and why such a master identity programme would evolve sub-Judaic slave identities as Christianity and Islam, to extend itself into a tripartite hierarchical physiology,

on route to unleashing its potential to form a global superorganism, containing the entire human biomass of the planet. Accordingly we learn how to understand the whole of human history, as a manifestation of the control of this binding 'force of identity', and hence why knowledge exists, what linguistic force is, and why the war between religion and science is endemic to our world. We see how the societies outside Judaism have been attacked and consumed relentlessly down the centuries, and we understand all, according to the simple principle inherent in the above quote. But although Lilienfeld makes this observation, he does not make the ensuing conclusions. So, once again, we find Lilienfeld has all the crucial elements of knowledge pertaining to a true understanding of human existence, but he fails to make these ideas emerge in concrete form. This was left to the anti-Semites, most especially the Nazis, who thereby made such knowledge as Lilienfeld handles here, taboo.

Page 67 — Point three is a little vague, but it is interesting to see some discussion of the hierarchical principle concerning the social structure, which some of our criticisms have suggested Lilienfeld did not appreciate at all.

Point four is also tricky to get a handle on, but the nub of this attempt to understand the part of consciousness in human superorganisms leads us to think of linguistic force generating a programme, that exists as an information flux contained within the body of the superorganism. This 'information flux' is what we know as 'culture' and it is written to the 'hard drives' we call our 'brains', to induct us into the fabric of the superorganism that we call 'society'. *Consciousness* has therefore nothing whatever to do with this subject. 'Consciousness' is a code word intended to reinforce the idea of the individual, existing in their own right. A genome creates a body that preserves the genome, there is no awareness involved in this process, it is simply a material manifestation of universal existence, where any consciousness that does exist is *part of* the product, not the progenitor of the being which displays the so called 'consciousness'.

Page 68 — This sentence makes a superb statement : "Although the person is now more aware of himself and his position in the social association where there is the higher psycho-physiological potential of their being, nevertheless the connection between the laws of regulation and social dynamics escapes them just as well as in the case of the individual cell, and it may serve as a proof that even now there is the outspoken conviction on the part of outstanding intellects that there would be no general regularity in social development otherwise."

This point is the very foundation of organicism, for it is the most forceful expression of the idea that there is no such thing as an individual existing as an end in themselves. Here Lilienfeld says that no matter how aware the person is of their existence within society, they are nonetheless totally oblivious of the real underlying laws, forces and dynamics. He says some high ranking intellectuals insist this is necessary for social order to exist, and again this is indeed a basic scientific principle which of itself makes it certain that organicism is the only true basis of sociology. It is a great pity that Lilienfeld does not name these people, and cite the relevant works ! These statements are glaring denunciations of the sociology we have ruling our world today, and as such a condemnation of all science, without the total corruption of which, these basic facts could not be suppressed.

The next obvious point to make concerns the nature of religion, and indeed the nature of language. He should indicate that the existence of natural laws driving human behaviour unwittingly, combined with the recognition that people cannot know these laws consciously, must mean a subconscious programme connects people to these laws of social existence. These laws must apply in all true social organisations, and as such apply equally to insects and mammals, that are socially organised. Clearly language evolved to provide this linkage, the linguistic programme that creates social structure, and religion is the kernel of the programme that provides the exoskeleton of social order, upon which the flesh of social being is hung. Accordingly we

can say that it is the detail of the advanced religious programme, such as we see in Judaism, that makes the unwitting connection between the individual and the superorganic being, otherwise known as 'God', and therefore it is this which he should state at this time, by affirming that the unknown laws 'are known' in the form of religious imperatives, and it is from this fact that religion derives its power.

I have highlighted the page number above in red because I find this passage the most potent so far.

We may continue with this most important section : —

“Just as one does not feel, think and desire, if one places himself on the Christian religious standpoint, the individual unit and humanity as each complete in themselves, but rather that God prevails in each human living together, as well as in the entire story of humanity. In addition this outlook may contribute in evoking the conviction that the organic method in sociology, correctly used and understood, does not lead to a materialistic, but rather, to an idealistic world view.”

If we adopt the Christian view of life, he tells us, we recognise that the individual is not an end in themselves, but that God comes into being through the unity of all people, as made manifest through the course of time. This is making religion the medium of the laws of human organic nature, and making identity the key to the reality of God's existence in this context, because of the continuity of Christian existence. This suggests why history is so important to Judaism, because it is the story of the Jewish superorganism, and without the story there can be no such organism.

Here Lilienfeld practically says what we want him to say most of all, that religion offers the means by which the natural dynamics of our corporate human nature are realised. Unfortunately he reduces this most profound of all insights to a lame individualistic mode of interpretation, instead of disregarding the individual altogether and making the superorganism the sole extant being. If he did this he would analyse the role of religion in purely functional terms, and not confuse us with moralistic talk. He ought to of seen that Christianity is a slave identity of Judaism, this is blindingly obvious and crucial to a true interpretation of all that he is seeking to interpret, such that we can but wonder how a man could devote his life to such a subject and demonstrate that he knew so much, and yet miss this blindingly obvious connection between the superorganic form and its true identity, which is Jewish, *not Christian*.

He says this Christian view applied scientifically to society is idealistic in its potential, rather than materialistic, as it is said to be by its critics. But of course he is wrong, and it is because he is not seeing the true meaning of this approach, whereby the Christian view is seen as so ideal just because it is the representation of the laws of superorganic being as they apply to the slave element of the biomass, which demands subservience and dependence, and hence an idealistic simplicity. We do not find this pathetic simplicity in the Jewish master identity, Jews are programmed to think of themselves as the Chosen, to whom all Earth is to be gifted, and nothing is to stand in the way of their taking possession of all Earth. We see this Jewish attitude being displayed in its full might in Israel today, where no one can stand in their way and they steal land because, they declare, God commanded them to go forth and multiply, and they need land in order to obey this command from *their* God. He omits to identity the master element, that of Jewish identity proper, which is invasive, destructive and abusive, as are all master classes, in all human societies. This tells us why Lilienfeld failed to see what we see, and where his real flaw lay in terms of his presentation as a foremost promoter of science applied to humanity.

When he turns to the arguments of anti-organicists he rightly draws our attention to a general ploy of the priest, who is only concerned to control knowledge by subverting sound reasoning in order to protect the obscene ideas of religious myth, upon which social power is based. This shifting between levels is a fundamental ploy. Indeed, when we come ask ourselves how we might disabuse someone of their cultural stupidity, by getting them to understand reality in terms of superorganics, we first have recall to the idea of 'levels of being' surrounding us as individuals, that we are all familiar with. Thus, we have the case of our place on the planet, as compared to the reality of our situation revealed by science. We are in motion, because the planet is in motion, but to all intents and purposes we are stationary, confined as we are, within the cocoon of stability we experience as *part of* the surface of the Earth.

The discussion of puerile criticisms hardly seems worthwhile. The question of direct analogues of unitary physiology, appearing at the level of superorganic being, is in reality a further example of the kind we have just seen Lilienfeld deal with, that of shifting between levels without acknowledging the logical consequences of such a shift. The whole point of the organicist argument is that unitary elements have evolved to form higher grades of being. This is what Bernard's theory of colonial evolution deals with, dealt with in *The Colonial Ape*. It follows that a qualitative shift in the nature of the unit, compared to the whole of which it is a structural element, must exist. This would apply at the subatomic level of matter, and the atomic level where elements become something different when they form compounds that create the matter we experience, hence water is composed of two elemental gases. This applies at the level of cellular elements making up living forms too. And it applies where animal superorganisms are concerned, applying equally to ants and humans. Do these lunatics ask where the antennae, jaws and legs of the ant superorganism are ? No. But is this considered grounds for objecting to the idea of insect superorganisms ? Certainly not, no one would even think for one moment to be so stupid, *because who cares what scientists say about insects !* And this says it all about such idiocy, it is just miscreant game playing by the orders that rule society, and hence, as we say, not worth bothering with.

Page 70 — His ideas regarding the induction of unitary elements of higher being into the matrix of the whole entity are amazingly crude, primitive and, one has to say, downright stupid. I just do not get this. It is as if he is determined to preserve the most sacred aspects of individual life in society, which we see associated with the process of acculturation here. His argument seems to assert that acculturation takes place in society, and cannot be questioned by the organicist method, and must be taken at face value. Therefore, since we know the same physiological laws must apply at all levels of living existence, as he has just asserted, then cells must also be assumed to be inducted into the body ! This is too crazy for words. Unfortunately it conforms to the incredible failure to see Christianity as the induction of the none Jewish human biomass into the sphere of the Jewish master race, to form a slave biomass of Jewish superorganic being. Lilienfeld is determined to preserve the sanctity of human individual integrity, no matter how, repeatedly, he perfectly dismisses this individual status.

Page 71 — We always treat psychology as the key enemy of organicism because it makes the individual an end in themselves. It seems that Lilienfeld is conforming to this bias here, he says : "The change in social energy is itself directly connected to the results of the enervation occurring in the individual nervous system.", and goes on to make the superorganism a product of individual beings thereby. This is not how we see the matter at all. Elsewhere we have elaborated the idea that all that ideas to do with 'mind' and 'psyche' or 'psychology' are really dealing with, is the existence of language. For us linguistic physiology is the repository of linguistic force, that projects an accumulative linguistic programme into the form of a living, growing superorganic

physiology, wherein the linguistic programme resides as a 'social culture', and from whence it is transmitted to each succeeding generation of 'cellular persons'. So we have a situation in which a generic individual physiology acts as the foundation of superorganic being, but in such a way that the facet of superorganic being that Lilienfeld is seeking to understand here, exists outside the individual, in terms of its psychological origins, whereby the individual *takes in* the 'social enervation', they do not *give it out*. The relationship of the individual to this dynamic is one of passive receiver, who, in the act of reception, thereby becomes an active agent of physiological being. Thus we cannot present a purely simple description of these social factors pertaining to what is called 'psychology', we must recognise that there is a structural entity, individuals are part of that structure, and as such they are involved in a process of induction and activation.

We can compare the situation with that of the body created by a genome, wherein there is change, but not within the body during life time. The act of transformation in genetics is managed by the sexually induced recombination of gametes. This process allows stability, interspersed with structured change. Clearly the same operation is necessary at the level of social being, otherwise all would be chaos. The general mode of explanation is that individuals make change happen by virtue of willpower in respect of creative effort, followed by conscious acceptance on the part of the masses, of what their leaders have achieved for them. How gross is this idea ! This is absurd in the extreme. *Change never occurs at the behest of individuals*. The superorganism always has a core master organ, in our world this is the Jews. Change occurs because these masters are always seeking to exploit the social biomass they rule over, and they came to power—in an act of critical structural change—by exterminating former master organs, such as the Druids, Incas, etc. If this description were not essentially correct, in terms of the evolutionary dynamic it describes, then social order would not exist on any extended level, whereas, in fact, it exists to a staggering, almost mind-bendingly incredible degree. So much so that the Jewish master race has been able to predict its domination of all Earth thousands of years in advance, and see its prediction come true, relentlessly.

The equivalent of sexual change in genetic orders of being is found in the reordering of the One message, otherwise called the 'linguistic programme' or the 'social culture', which gives the superorganism its physiology. This change can occur in a progressive manner, where the core authority does not change completely, or it may occur in an absolute manner, where the core organ is killed off and replaced by an entirely new order of master identity. The process is essentially the same in society as in genetics, in that the base parameter of structural change involves the transformation of information, contained in a highly elaborate and structured programme, in one case it is a genetic programme and in the other a linguistic programme. These are differences in the kind of information, but not in the nature of the information product, which in both cases is a programme delivering organic structure. And that is all there is to it.

We must acknowledge that Lilienfeld did not have the benefit of knowing about genetics, that we post war people have grown up with, empowering our ability to think about the ideas that Lilienfeld grew up with, that had been erased from our 'social culture', forcing us to rediscover the science his generation lived and breathed, so that we can now apply modern knowledge that the first generation of organicist scientists did not have the benefit of. They could not jump forward in time, but we can reach back.

It is of course nice to see Lilienfeld promoting the inclusion of sociology within the parameters of science, especially since the consequences of the great cleansing events known as the 'World Wars' have eradicated this possibility and returned us to the slave state, subject to an overt, but nonetheless absolute theocracy, that will tolerate no application of science, of any kind, to the subject of human nature and existence.

This said, as noted already, we cannot be pleased to see this deference to the notion of idealism as the end product of such an application of science to society. We may believe that

access to true knowledge is ultimately beneficial to any other way of living, but this is an idealistic, philosophical position, one that may be untrue, it may not be possible for humans to live with true knowledge, there is nothing to suggest that we can so far. Hence for us a consideration of such matters can have nothing whatever to do with the initial determination of reality. To think otherwise is to side with religion in the eternal war of religion against science, and as atheist scientists that is a position we oppose from the outset, whatever the cost may be, believing thereby, that the extermination of all humanity is preferable to living as slaves of religion, as we do now, and as, hitherto, we always have lived.

Page 72 — What we would like to say here, in relation to these general musings on the defence of the organic method in sociology, is that this seems like the place to take notice of the ongoing, relentless war of religion against science. However, thanks to Darwin the link between science and religion was severed, such that a sterile science could emerge and exist safely, side by side with religion—a logically impossible thing for any real science. Since Lilienfeld recognises Darwin as valid science, we can see how he would fail to see the problem here. The best we could have hoped for is the presumption of an atheist imperative attached to any true science, and the consequent logical assertion that as long as religion existed, it is evident that science does not. He could at least have recognised, notwithstanding his validation of Darwin, that much of the antagonism toward a real science of society was due to the fatal impact such an—organicist—idea must have for religion. It is however just here that we may imagine that his belief in the idealism of the organicist method comes into play, and indeed, this is presumably what his final volume, volume five of his *Thoughts Concerning the Social Science of the Future*, was all about, making organicist science produce a new type of religion. This is no use to us, and hence our disappointment with the lack of any mention of the eternal struggle of science against the subversive oppression of priestcraft.

It is curious to see the contention over the terms ‘superorganism’ and ‘natural organism’ being made much of, and once again we find ourselves lamenting the absence of references to the combatants concerned in a fray discussed by Lilienfeld, preventing us from examining the relevant work for ourselves, or trying to.

Reading his discussion of the subject is not wholly enlightening, which is a pity because we are curious to know what the issue is here, for him. We assume a superorganism is denominated as such because its cellular units are themselves integral unitary organisms, undergoing an independent birth and death, albeit living out their lives as structural elements of a higher organic order, a ‘superorganism’. Evidently this is not the issue here. We see that Lilienfeld discusses the higher structural elements of the body, as in nervous tissue relative to the meat, in terms of a higher order of organic matter, and as such superorganic. This is reasonable enough, but relevant to the denomination superorganic. So it seems that when Lilienfeld declares human society to be a real organism he has something in mind other than what we are thinking of, he is thinking of society as body, along somewhat analogical lines. It is tricky to be more clear about this subtle point with the level of translation provided by machine, so we can remain intrigued about the precise nature of this discussion.

Page 74 — We have a nice long discussion concerning the balance between free will and necessity. It would be nice to have an accurate translation of this extended piece, as it is we can only get the gist of the discussion. Accordingly we may respond in general terms by saying that, somewhat as he seems to say, whatever degrees of apparent free will there may be, in the end they are so constrained as to be essentially nothing more than an illusion. I have paused to make this comment, where he mentions the Central American civilisations, for I have never forgotten this particularly delightful observation from the time I first made this translation. The point

being that the Inca and Aztec cultures offer a unique opportunity to consider human civilisation so independently formed as to be the equivalent of our having gone to another planet and found a comparative case of evolution, that is so like our own as to be parallel, although superficially radically different in many of the elaborate cultural forms, generated by the expression of linguistic force in this different, isolated location. Such comparison is exactly what we would expect to find, the main physiology of the human superorganism must be indistinguishable wherever it takes root, but the parameters of identity produced by linguistic force are akin to colourations, and as such may take an infinite variety of forms, much as we may find in the diversity of physiological expression pertaining to any widely dispersed species, I imagine.

We can but enjoy his discussion of how the superorganism forms according to universal biological laws, leading up this delightful observation : “The Aztecs and Incas were not directed according to anyone, but rather listened to the unavoidable necessities of social dynamics.” This invokes the idea we have stated above, and elsewhere, often, that religion is the linguistic programme that makes the unwitting connection between the individual and the superorganism, dictating individual behaviour, and thus constructing a superorganism along lines dictated by nature. Thus : *society is created by nature*. Lilienfeld had it all, but could not see what he had.

As delightful as we must find this section on comparative superorganic forms, whose order is dictated by natural law, the conclusion based on the nature of a living individual, undergoing growth, maturity and death, is weak and disappointing. I thought we had already found a reference in the above, to the relative immortality of superorganic forms, being due to the fact that they are composed of mortal units, while not being constrained by an such fixed term attached to a unitary physiological body, themselves. This kind of superorganic immortality applies in relation to other species of superorganism, such as ants or corals, whose persistence as a superorganism can be long indeed, so I believe. Of course thoughts of this kind explain why ideas of immortality should find a natural expression in human cultures, including the more primitive ones, along with ideas about life after death and the enduring power of the ancestors. This reflects the fact that there is no such thing as an individual, that we do not exist, so that it is actually as true a statement as any, to say that those who are dead, live on, as we will also, in our turn. The only error in these ideas is their intuitive rendering of reality, an error of the same kind as the one that perceives the superorganism as God.

Page 75 — I love it when these people make use of insect societies for comparison with humans, this is so perfect. Imagine a modern scientists doing this ! It is an absolute taboo to do so today, one that is acknowledged by modern scientists, occasionally, when the occasion requires. That said, I am not sure that we can get too carried away with the substance of the comparison Lilienfeld is making here, apart from the general principle of the ant as an individual. The most useful comparison that can be made in this context is that between the conditions pertaining to a slave maker ant species and our own mammalian version of the slave maker species, the Jews. In slave maker ant nests the pupae are stolen in raids and then, being born inside the slave maker’s nest, they absorb the ‘social culture’ and *think* they are home, having no means to know otherwise. In Christian and Muslim societies babies are born in a society where they acquire an identity that enslaves them to Judaism, via the medium of a specially crafted Jewish slave identity implant, that allows the slave to perceive themselves as different to the master. The Christian/Muslim slave then works unwittingly to realise the Jewish master plan, all the while thinking they do what they do for themselves, for their own kind, even thinking that the masters they protect and serve, are all the while their inferiors !

Imagine if Lilienfeld had said this—to *die for* ! This is my dream find, a statement of this relationship between Christians and Jews, made during the pre-Great Cleansing event of 1914-18. So far I have looked in vain, much to my consternation. I cannot imagine anyone ever wrote this publicly, but I wonder if anyone ever recognised the reality of this idea. The only hint toward

this possibility that I know of is to be found in *Physics and Politics* by Walter Bagehot, 1872, where he says we protect the Jews for reasons he will not take any further. The only people who do shift in the direction of making this most dangerous of revelations, are the manic Christian anti-Semites. Thereby the Christian slave serves their Jewish master by leading the fight against the Jews in such a way that their certain failure can only mean that Jews will be protected by Christians after the horror of the resulting pogrom event, induced by the Christian *rebellion*. What *would* be fatal to the Jewish master organ, is the likes of Lilienfeld's arguments, made perfect by us.

In early times every sort of advantage tends to become a military advantage ; such is the best way, then, to keep it alive. But the Jewish advantage never did so ; beginning in religion, contrary to a thousand analogies, it remained religious. For that we care for them ; from that have issued endless consequences. But I cannot deal with such matters here, nor are they to my purpose.

(Bagehot, p. 63, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1890.)

This is a fascinating remark by Bagehot. If we did not know what the real implications were this would mean very little, but using our knowledge of human corporate nature we can see how this remark is a telling observation. When saying that "every sort of advantage tends to become a military advantage" he can only be talking about the 'master race', the power that rules. He then goes on to say that "the Jewish advantage never did so", which can only mean that when the Jews became the master race they did not achieve this outcome via militarism, but rather, via religion. So it is because Jewish power is based on religion "that we care for them", he says. Then, to our intense frustration, he declines to unveil this matter anymore. But it is evident that such an argument can only be implying that somehow Jewish power was accessing an underlying force of human nature, that proved to be more powerful than those forces which meet us square on. It is from such ideas that we find weird dogmas appearing in Judaism such as the Christian saying "The meek shall inherit the Earth." This idea makes no sense whatever, on the face of it, but it is true, after a fashion, because it is a coded reference to the underlying corporate nature of human animals, whereby the human form is superorganic, being evolved to bring a living organism into being at the level of social organisation, wherein, the overpowering attribute of 'meekness', is the power derived from mindless enslavement to a master race. 'Mindlessness' and 'enslavement', in conjunction with the existence of a master race, represent aspects of a highly integrated superorganic physiology, hence the value in reality of these manifestations of superorganic being that we only know about courtesy of political expressions. The master race is the core power base, but the slave body is an integral part of the resulting superorganism, and as such the slave experiences the triumph of power at the individual level of experience, and hence Christians and Muslims *feel* like the master race, even though, in truth, they are the slaves of the Jews. Though ultimately, all these differential political statuses merge into the one reality of superorganic being, which is the only true reality of human existence.

Bagehot's work was organicist, after a fashion, the above remarks carry the imperative impulse of organicism, and early on in the work he makes the deeply organicist observation that in society any kind of organisation is better than none. We may wonder just how far a man like this could be evinced the argument we make out, concerning the true nature of human nature, and that of the various religious forms, accordingly. All of which tells us how dangerous science was to Judaism at this time, before it was suppressed, and why the Jews had to have the two world wars, the Nazis, the holocaust and finally, but by no means minimally, the massive ingress of Islam into Europe, in order to recover their dominance over their slave populations. Science could not be left to its own devices, and it wasn't.

We make the Jews the benefactors of this outcome, but as we just noted the slave biomass is rendered symbiotic with its master, just as in the case of slave maker and slave biomass. So the present populations of Christians continue to act as if they were the victors of the world wars, wherein they recovered their freedom to be Christians, from the threat of the Nazis. Nothing could be further from the truth, and knowing the true nature of these superorganic dynamics is quite amazing, as the world celebrates its wars, fought in order to recover their slave status, even as they call this slave status 'freedom'. The obvious question is What else can people do ? Power is derived from enslavement to a religious identity, so we all benefit from the process of enslavement. There is no problem as long as we never see through the deception, as long as we believe our identity programming. If however we have seen through the deception, we are in a position to consider the issues involved in being a biologically formed superorganism, which, by definition, has no control over its existence, and can only shift headlong toward self destruction, in the very act of living to the maximum degree possible, which is what nature demands of its human beings. This question becomes relevant when we face the destruction of the biosphere at our own hands. But as we look on at the arguments about global warming, as we approach the Copenhagen conference, we can see that there is no real hope of our taking the reins from mother nature, because we have not the faintest idea what is going on, we have no idea what we are, or why we do what we do. So all will be as it will be, and we will learn what we may, the hard way. One day we will be extinct, and this is undeniable, and no creature will ever of deserved extinction, as we do ; that much free will we may concede there is, though it be a negative quotient only.

We are always keen to examine any references to language occurring in any organicist work, because for us language is the be all and end all of everything, in terms of understanding human society according to a naturalistic model. Accordingly we want to ponder on this : "There can therefore be an economy of the social nervous system in the sense of speech, like a physiology of the individual nervous system and especially of the human brain." We say that linguistic force, being a natural force, creates all superorganic physiology, that is called 'social structure'. The sentence taken from Lilienfeld vaguely exudes the sentiment we evince. A perfect translation is what we really need here, but he seems to be saying that language has a role in creating superorganic physiology.

Page 76 — The above argument continues and reaches a further consideration of the biological function of language, within the context of superorganic being : "Language, and art, that according to its being is also nothing other than an illustrated form of speaking, form the means through which the energy change in the social nervous system operates as a self driven process." This piece is of particular interest because of the way it recognises that language does not only appear in the form of language, as such. The general principle of a linguistic force creating superorganic physiology, means that linguistic force existed long before language, where role of this force in the evolution of a superorganic mammal induced the perfection of linguistic physiology which generated a true linguistic flux, able to create a perfect superorganic mammalian being. Here Lilienfeld does not extend the logic of language's functional role in superorganic physiology backwards, but he does shift it sideways, recognising that other mediums of the force of language, in this case art, also exist, and are to be thought of as nothing other than a linguistic medium. This is good.

One further detail we find in this quote is the recognition of the self driven dimension of social being, derived from the existence of language. This means that language creates a programme dictating the formation of social structure by directing the behaviour of individuals, it can mean nothing else ; and indeed we find a description to this effect in this section of the work. This is equivalent to recognising the role of genetics as an expression of linguistic force also, that

creates a programme creating a species, which also constitutes a self driven process. This is therefore a most important observation to take notice of. In saying that linguistic force existed long before language, we reach the pinnacle of this logic when we find linguistic force to be the force revealed in genetics.

“The primary means through which the unified thoughts and desires of people are caused to come into being, by means of reflection, is, as we have said, language. Therefore we believe we have been justified in setting up the thesis : the person became a cultural being by means of what was spoken in the progress of the history of humanity.”

This quote carries more important reflections upon the centrality of language in superorganic physiology. There is little more we can say about this topic courtesy of this quote, but it is a gem, and we add it to our selections for this reason. The only significant element of this quote is perhaps the implication of language generating culture, in such a way as to cause an increasingly advanced superorganic physiology to come into being. This is relevant to the idea of language creating a programme, that instructs the ‘sentient brick’ individuals, in their role of bringing superorganic physiology into being.

The following discussion of the nature of economics relative to linguistically generated culture, is useful in that it denies the political mantra which seeks to make human will the leading factor in social life. The observation regarding the implantation of a Jewish superorganism in Australia, where formerly there had only been the far less developed superorganic form preserved in the linguistic programme of aboriginal superorganic being, is a further example of his delightful use of comparison between Jewish civilisation as an extending organic being, meeting lesser alien superorganisms all around the planet, and replacing them, because of the linguistic programme dictating the form of social structure operating in the land, where, in terms of comparative energy differentials existing between the two superorganic forms, land occupied by primitive peoples is effectively void of human life. The void is filled as the alien master race invades the land, until the differentials equalise, and then one superorganism exists throughout the world. At that point a different mode of superorganic evolution proceeds, as we saw in Europe during the twentieth century, where the population was forced to exterminate itself on mass, to allow an infusion of weaker aliens, namely Muslims, who are more firmly attached to their Jewish slave identity, so that Europe was *conquered* by the Jews last century, as Australia was conquered by the Jews two centuries earlier. The process of conquest is the same in both cases, though the method is superficially different, one involves fresh conquest, the other re-conquest via a process of enforced fragmentation and reorganisation. The process of fragmentation and reorganisation is in fact an ongoing process, lasting centuries, capitalism is such a process, it is a method of cultural cleansing that reduces all cultural forms to one pattern, thus enabling the Jewish master race, now based back in Israel, to farm the world with a maximum degree of efficiency.

There is an interesting aspect to his discussion of Stein’s commentary on sociology, where he says that even if sociology did merely confirm the Jewish moral mythology, it would be because science identified the natural laws and related forces inducing human obedience to such moral imperatives, and not because sociologists were the priests of a religious cult, who had found these morals imperatives to be the one true outlook for humanity. The sentiment expressed here is excellent.

Page 77 — “In so far as sociology selects the measure of social purposes as the object of its researches it thereby loses its purely scientific character, and changes itself into a theory of statesmanship. As such then it also makes to replace moralistic claims and those of religion, as was the case with St. Simon and Aug. Comte. The Organicist does not seek on their own behalf to

make any claim to be statesman. They restrict themselves to the investigation of the regularity of social dynamics. Then statesmanship may use the results of their researches to aid its previously established purpose.”

This quote affirms that sociology is supposed to *study* social life, not be a *part of* social life. This is a most important observation, one which is emphatically denied by modern sociologists, serving the priesthood as they do. To modern sociologists it is not possible for a person to be external to the society they are part of. This is absurd. Aliens from another planet would be external to our world, and they would possess an outlook befitting such a position. Therefore it is possible for sociologists to adopt a frame of mind akin to one whereby an alien intelligence incapable of communicating with us, would observe us, and seek to understand us according to the lights of science.

Once science had gained an insight into how society works statesmen could use those insights to inform their actions, he says, naively. So our Jewish masters, told by science that they were the masters on the basis of their religion, could then work to replace Judaism so that people could be free ! Yeah, that’s going to happen isn’t it !!

In reality the exact opposite occurred, as Judaism corrupted science ; induced major warfare ; caused the most horrific pogrom ever ; and now lives securely off the fat of its evil actions ; the state of Israel being secured ; the science of sociology being destroyed, and its resurrection being made taboo by the work of Adolf Hitler, the greatest ever saviour of the Jews.

We call our philosophy ‘atheist science’, so we hate religion with a passion, but our science requires us to understand religion. We see organicism as the deathblow to religion, but here Lilienfeld manages to use the same close approximation of organicism to religion, that we find fatal, to validate religion, thus : “We made an attempt in our “natural theology” to illuminate the parallelism between the Christian theory and the results of positive sociology along the lines discussed here. We ventured to undertake such a task from the conviction that the Christian theory can only be grasped in its full meaning and depth if it also becomes acknowledged as a representation of truth in the field of science.”

The book I most wanted in all the world was his “natural theology”, in order to see how he related organicism to religion. From this statement it appears we may find a good deal of interest, but that we must expect to be disappointed if we expect him to reduce religion to science. Although, that said, one wonders how he could take the approach he says, without performing such a reduction, and thereby destroying religion. Anyway, it is clear that Lilienfeld is enamoured of Christianity, and his eulogies to it are revolting.

Bridging onto the next page we find Lilienfeld setting forth a moralistic validation of organicism, somewhat in contradiction to the preceding declaration that sociology should not think of itself as part of society, but rather as a detached observer of society, that may contribute to society as a consequence of its scientific findings. The idea that children taught to think of society as an organism will be better equipped to serve society well, is to suggest that organicism can replace religion. There is certainly a place for an evaluation of the functional outcome of science applied to humans without reservation, but such an argument ought to be of the character of a scientific prospectus, rather a religious proclamation.

Page 78 — More discussion of the nature of Christianity, in the context of the nature of social order. This is interesting enough, but he does not get at the underlying biological imperatives implicit in such reasoning. He concludes that Christianity is ‘a truth’, which to us is a sign of the war of religion against science making itself felt, right at the heart of the very place where science should be found to be anathema to religion.

The eulogy to notable legislators from history, is best understood as a recognition of the underlying nature of human corporate nature, identified intuitively, and acted upon accordingly. Viewed according to this idea, we affirm the gist of what Lilienfeld is saying here. Once gain however, he chooses to assert that organicism is the only valid way for any political elite to operate, so that now, with the emergence of science, political figures have the opportunity to do consciously and deliberately, what past legislators could only do intuitively or unwittingly. This is a nice idea, but its proclamation as real, only serves to indicate how far from a true scientific stance people like Lilienfeld were, being determined to obey the dictates of political expediency rather than any impulse to discover real knowledge, known without regard for any other concerns.

Sociology must have a clear object in view, and this must be society seen as an organism. This idea is made futile by making the state or nation the object, rather than a biomass subject to one master identity, such as Judaism. This is a truly monumental error, and utterly tragic. He says that sociology has its true object and can be a true science, notwithstanding that there are so few sociologists tackling the subject from this correct scientific standpoint. This would be true if he and his fellow organicists had adopted the true vantage point with regard to the individuality of the superorganism. The critical matter in the subversion of science by religion is the emphasis upon the individual as an end in themselves. We can say that Lilienfeld has adopted the correct pivot of observation for sociology *in principle*, by realising that the individual does not exist as an end in themselves. But, amazingly, he and his fellow organicists of the period, then projected the individual person onto a higher plain, and made the nation into a person existing as an end in itself. The nation is an artefact of Jewish superorganic physiology, nations have never been the defining feature of any superorganism, as such a nation is obviously an exoskeletal structure of an overarching theocratic hegemony. Thus we discover a most important aspect of this period of organicist science, whereby we find that for all its appearances to the contrary, in reality organicism managed to secure its place upon the false pivot of observation—that of the individual existing as an end in themselves—simply by identifying a falsely constituted individual, that of the nation, and then making all the false attributes of political integrity apply at the level of the nation, instead of the false level of the individual person, and instead of the true level of unification, based on one common identity, namely that of Judaism.

Page 79 — “So that such intermediate disciplines are allowed to lay claim to an authorized existence, however it is the existence of a sociology with a recognition of its objectives concerned with the nation as an individual, that is above all most necessary.”

This quote nears the end, it protests that sociology has been fragmented into a host of pseudo sociological disciplines that are given status while a real sociology is itself nonexistent. This is so true, and it is no mistake, divide and conquer being the rule here. Even so we find the fatal error repeated, where the nation is made the embodiment of the superorganism, a truly staggering piece of stupidity. It is from this argument that National Socialism derived much of the logic for its vile nationalist dogma, as we may see by reading Hitler’s *Mein Kampf*. At the same time we do find evidence of question being asked, as to whether religion is not the true embodiment of the superorganism, overriding the physical limits of the nation. This can be found in one of Rene Worms treatises on sociology, where he finds against religion, and for the nation ! *No hope*.

“Those semi-sociologists however award the human state no personality, but rather grant this only to the individuals out of whom it comes to exist, and not in any case is this yet granted to the human species.”

This quote hints at the need for a biological human nature to be acknowledged. This is the single most important requirement for any human science to exist, it is therefore a golden

mantra of all human *sciences* today, existing within our absolute theocracy as they do, a crushing, oppressive authority that tolerates no free access to knowledge, no freedom of thought and no freedom of expression, that there is definitely, *no such thing as a biological human nature*. If there were then this would be uniform everywhere, and such an idea would be anathema to the individuality of the person upon which the slave ideology of Judaism rests.

I assume the meaning of the concluding Latin phrase is : *Without biology there can be no Sociology*.

It would be difficult to imagine a more true statement than this, but unfortunately this validity is of little help in terms of imposing the ascendancy of science upon the institutions of knowledge existing in this damned world.

Our favourite equivalent of this, Lilienfeld's logo, is the declaration that : *Humans are animals, that evolved on this planet, end of story*.

Once it is conceded that humans are animals, all religion is made null and void. But our academic priesthood freely concedes that humans are animals ! They say, it cannot be denied that humans are animals, but . . . and off they go paying no heed whatever to the opening statement of truth, as if it had no commanding implications. This would be like astronomers asserting that while it is true that the Earth is a rotating object, a planet, nonetheless, when all is said and done, science indicates that people are stationary, and not themselves objects doomed to perpetual motion.

We found a discussion of the levels of existence, the manifestation of a hierarchical reality to physical being, and how confusion could be manufactured by wilfully shifting between such levels, without acknowledging the conceptual consequences of a shift from one zone of reality to another. So as much as we love Lilienfeld's sociological logo, we must understand that such exclamations of rectitude are of no avail in terms of winning an argument against the priesthood. Power is everything, and it is political power that determines the form that knowledge takes, and nothing else. Lilienfeld should of known this, indeed, *all philosophers* should know this, or else, in the end, *they know nothing*.

APPENDIX

I found this item serving as an introduction to a hard copy of the translation, presumably written some five years ago. I offer it here as an appendix as it says something about what I was thinking about this work when I first produced it.

The Translation

A computer is a tool. This is not an everyday thought, but it may be increasingly appropriate as this machine becomes more and more capable of aiding people in a variety of creative activities.

What is a tool ?

We might feel inclined to say a tool is an artefact used to do work of various kinds. But it suits our purposes here to say the same thing, but from the other end, as it were, a tool being therefore an artificial aid extending the reach of our bodily organs. By saying this we introduce our own organic beings into the context of the tool, and so we begin to facilitate the natural conception of ourselves and our tools as integrated forms constituting one being.

This is still a completely unnatural point of view, one we most definitely do not use in our day to day expression of consciousness. Consequently there are gradations to which our sense of this idea of unity between the biological and the artificial may be expressed. We can all readily see that hand tools, like a mallet and a chisel, are very much extensions of our bodily organs ; although even here the language our brains are programmed to use in their offering of consciousness obscures even this much comprehension of our own true self, for we do not recognise that our hands are organs at all, we think of them as limbs, or parts thereof ; as if they too were, in some strange way, detached from that which is the real self. But in any case we do know that our hands are the supreme interface between ourselves and our tools, and the things we use tools to do ; and that our upper limbs evolved to serve this very purpose is also something we would easily recognise and accept. If we were to jump to a more obscure sense of the tool, one concerning an extension to a limb not purpose built for extension, the subject of linguistic authority would burst upon us. Thus if we say the car is a tool, one used to transport us, and therefore one that must be conceived of as an extension to our legs, our natural organs of transportation, then we would not get away with this without a fight. And there is a lot to fight for in this realm of definition.

Returning to the computer, we find ourselves in a very interesting situation as regards this idea of the tool. The computer, like any tool, while it has a formal use, can be put to many less formal, perhaps peripheral uses. A mallet may be used to murder someone, not an everyday requirement, for most of us, but a possible use none the less, albeit peripheral. I use a computer mostly to write, creatively, and for me it is the most impressive tool I can conceive of, it is an extension of my brain, a tool my brain takes hold of, albeit via the fingers of my hand ; and I suppose I could venture into the realms of voice recognition software and so on, but as yet I have not. A chisel might serve the same purpose in the hands of a craftsman but I am not such a person. A pen might do as good a job as a computer, some might say. But I have taken us on a diversion away from the immediate discussion of the subject at hand, the translation of a German scientist's work into English, because this translation that I put before you here has been done by a computer, I neither speak nor understand German, nor do I particularly want to. My computer is a mind tool coming into its own, doing what only a brain suitably informed could ever of done on behalf of its owner, if we put it that way, in the past.

I am an amateur intellectual, I do what I do solely for the pleasure of doing it, for a sense of personal need, for personal satisfaction concerned with my sense of my place in this thing we call existence. I do what I do the way that I do it because there is no other way to learn the things I want to learn, to know what I want to know. As such I work alone, I have no colleagues, no peer group, no fellow colleagues to share thoughts with, to bandy ideas with, to engage in debate with. I know of no other people anywhere who have the same interest as me, and I have no idea how they might be found if they exist, such efforts as I have made suggest I am the only person interested in the scientific comprehension of human society alive on this planet today ; but I cannot assume this for certain, and as the work of this German author proves there was once a tiny group of European scholars who were interested in exactly this subject. Consequently I cannot seek the kind of assistance a translation of the works I need to read to advance my knowledge, by way of professional translations as a professor in some university might. It is hard enough for me to even track down the works of past intellectuals who have studied the subject I am so passionate about, that we review by way of this translation presented here. This said, my personal passion is a product of the times I live in, and so not personal at all in this sense, and hence I hope my discovery of long lost knowledge about the true nature of human nature will be of some interest to others who have followed their own course relative to this, at least superficially common interest, in the subject of human nature.

It is necessary to provide these brief remarks as to my status in respect to the academic establishment because otherwise it might be wondered what the point of going about a challenging task such as this is, in this way, by using a computer. I was eventually led to Paul v. Lilienfeld as the most committed exponent of an idea which I had come upon all on my own and worked out the logic of, likewise for myself. The idea being, that human beings evolved to form an organism at the level of social organisation. Lilienfeld wrote one main work in German, as far as I am aware, and there is this monograph I present here, neither of which have been translated previously. Keeping to the theme of the computer age, it so happens that the internet has given access to the world's supply of books in the most astounding way, and upon looking, I found obtaining this academic's work from Germany was as easy, or even easier, than popping down to Smiths, or the local library for any current volume. So I determined to buy the *Defence* and see if I could get someone to translate it, but as my attention focused on the task and my thoughts turned to software able to do the job for me, I was delighted to find this too, like magic, was also possible. Delightful.

This much said, we must bear in mind two facets of this effort, firstly the limitations of the method, secondly the requirements of the objective. As in the use of any tool there is a question of the degree of tolerance involved in the operations to which it is to be applied. In this case, while the limitations are considerable in terms of rendering a fine piece of work in the form of a good translation, the requirements are not so demanding as to make this difficulty a hindrance to the effort, as I hope will be perfectly clear from the result.

In the first place this piece of work by Lilienfeld is itself an overview, as such it is concerned with themes, and not details, he effectively states this in his preface. Thus we need to draw from the work a flow of ideas that are consistent in their revelations so that we may understand the line of reasoning of the author. If you attempt to read the translation you will find the expression awkward in places as I have simply given the best rendering of the machine's offering I could, and this was a considerable challenge which was aided by my own immense sympathy for, and interest in the subject. If you persist, and do not allow yourself to get bogged down in an attempt to understand the detail of Lilienfeld's argument where the expression is obscure, then you will get from this translation what I wanted to get from it myself. That is a clear impression of the conviction the author had of the idea that society was a true organism. You will also see emerge the fact that the academic value of sociology as a science was the issue he was fighting for in this *Defence*, a fight he appears to of known he and his fellow Organicists were seriously in danger of losing, and lose they most certainly did, to the great detriment of all

humanity. The consequence has been the complete subversion of all science pertaining to the subject of life, from beginning to end, a truly staggering and quite unbelievable thought. If I had not discovered this for myself I simply would not have believed it was possible in this age of knowledge and freedom, in which we all think we live. Which of course suggests it is likely to be a futile thing to do, to attempt to communicate the real state of affairs to the world at large. But one can try, it is not as if I have anything else better to do with my life ; I have already spent it just trying to figure out what on earth is going on in this madhouse we call society.

The subject matter itself is of a most unusual kind, really quite unique in this day and age, and as such quite an astounding thing to comprehend in itself, quite apart from what the substance of the idea is. Why should I make this claim on behalf of our subject ? Simply because it is a case of revelation, not of an ordinary kind, nor yet of a unique kind, although most certainly of a unique kind in our world at the present day, and if I succeed in my objective, it will be of a unique kind in the history of humanity. This is because I am turning to the work of a nineteenth century German scholar-philosopher as a Roman intellectual might have turned to the work of Greek philosophers who tried to bring the heavens down to earth, so to speak, to reveal a most astounding and earth shattering piece of knowledge, concerning the place of the earth relative to the other celestial bodies, which, when discovered formerly, for the first time that we moderns have any record of, was soon submerged by all the means at the disposal of social authority. But the potential rescue of ancient knowledge did not take place in the ancient world, its resurrection is associated with the dawn of the modern era when Copernicus, aided by Galileo's ocular extension, finally shattered the old model of ignorance and ushered in the new enlightenment and with it the knowledge of reality in a way not known before, giving us the scientific age.

Yet here we are today, faced with precisely the same set of conditions, and yet in this work I take on the role of a man of my own time exploding the myth of my own time, so elaborately constructed to maintain the age old grip of religion upon our minds, and to keep us in a state of abysmal ignorance ; which is, it is true, our normal condition within which we feel most at ease, and content. This is the objective of this work, to reveal the real science of humanity. And this goes hand in hand with a real expression of atheism, which must perforce make the theists worst nightmare come true by proving that God does not exist, by killing 'God', as we know it, by making it impossible for people, on mass, to believe in God anymore. That is the goal toward which I have directed my intelligence all my life, I did not expect to find myself achieving the insights pertinent to the cause, and having done so I certainly did not expect to find the same work had already been done at exactly the time it should have been done in the first place, but had been hushed up and erased from memory in precisely the same manner as we like to speak of in the ancient world, as we polish the head of our collective ego and tell ourselves what clever little darlings we are. But this is the case, and in making this translation I seek to resurrect from obscurity the work of the leading exponent of the correct scientific interpretation of human nature and human existence.

Lilienfeld's own argument, as presented here, falls far short of reaching the proper conclusion to which he should have taken it, and this is a further reason why we need not be troubled by a lack of precision or fluency in the translation. My motivation for publishing this translation is to try and find a vehicle for the presentation of my argument extolling the idea that human nature is corporate, and as such identical to the nature of other superorganic species, such as ants. Thus you will not need the detail of Lilienfeld's argument, I will make up the shortfall, and then some. By riding on the back of this donkey, made for the purpose, I hope to pass through the portal into the citadel, and so to reduce it to rubble with a correct scientific presentation of reality, and to reduce that ancient citadel to rubble once and for all, and so let the enlightenment have a second wind, and see if it cannot blow a little fairer than it did at its first puff.